

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. XCIV.]

OCTOBER, 1852.

[VOL. VIII.]

THE RESTORATION OF BELIEF.*

It will be our principal object in the present article to lay before our readers the argument in favour of Christianity which is contained in a pamphlet recently published under the title of *The Restoration of Belief*. This title is intended to designate a series of Essays, of which the pamphlet before us is the first; the subordinate title of the present attempt being, *Christianity in relation to its Ancient and Modern Antagonists*. We could have desired that the work had been issued in a completed form. The force of much that is already said depends upon the character of what remains to be said; and our judgment of the importance of the reasoning here adopted would be influenced by the position it was seen to occupy in the whole discussion. We believe the design of making this fragment into a separate book has done some injury to it as it stands; for it is to that we attribute the manifest disproportion between the preparation for and the actual development of its matter.

We need scarcely say, that the pamphlet under notice has made a considerable stir in the religious world; and that it has called forth an attack of corresponding notability in the last number of the *Westminster Review*. It does not seem to us that the reviewer has at all done justice to the subject of his animadversion; and we shall therefore take occasion to point out what we think the real state of the case as to the controversy which has thus taken place. We may be able by this means to give greater clearness to our own views, while we do something toward correcting prevalent misapprehension.

The essential point of the Essay under consideration is a defence of the Historical form in which Christianity sets forth the religion it teaches. Our author fixes his attention, all along, upon that position of unbelief which repudiates "the endeavour to link Religion to History, or to send us back for our faith and morals to past ages."† "Very often of late," he says, "we have been told that the human mind has now at length reached so mature a condition, as fits it for the task of working out for itself the elements of morality, and the principles of Religion too—so far as Religion may still seem to be serviceable or necessary. This it is said we may all do for ourselves without the aid of a Book."‡

The truth of this representation is denied by the reviewer.

* *The Restoration of Belief*. No. I. Christianity in relation to its Ancient and Modern Antagonists. Pp. 112. Cambridge—Macmillan and Co. 1852.

† *The Westminster Review*, New Series, No. III., July, 1852. London—John Chapman, 142, Strand.

‡ *The Restoration of Belief*, p. 14.

§ *Ibid.* p. 60.

"The author misconceives the objection of Theodore Parker and others to the ordinary doctrine of historical revelation. They do not, as he affirms, 'disjoin religion from history,' or in the least decline the 'travelling back to ages past' on its account. It is not the *presence* of God in antiquity, but his presence *only* there,—not his inspiration in Palestine, but his withdrawal from every spot besides,—not even his supreme and unique expression in Jesus of Nazareth, but his absence from every other human medium,—against which these writers protest."*

This, we submit, is an avoidance of the question in dispute. When Christian believers speak of a historical revelation, they refer to a supernatural communication of religious truth. The revelation they identify with history is not a mere publication of doctrine, but a divine sanction to the doctrine proclaimed. Such a revelation as this, Theodore Parker and those with whom he may be classed undoubtedly disclaim; and in this sense, the only one to which the argument properly refers, they "disjoin religion from history." To tell us that "it is not the presence of God in antiquity, but his presence only there," against which they protest, is not the whole truth. They protest against any *such kind* of presence there as the Christian claim supposes. In Theodore Parker's sense of the word, no one disputes that inspiration is as universal as he states it to be; but to reduce what is understood by a historical revelation to a level with such inspiration, is to renounce, not to uphold, the religious connection which the phrase expresses. The real state of the business may be ascertained in a moment by means of the inquiry, Does Theodore Parker accept the alleged supernatural facts of Christianity, in the miraculous form in which they are recorded? He does not; and therefore he rejects that bearing of History upon Religion which the case involves. His using Christian history, like any other history, as an auxiliary to the natural investigation of religion, is only an additional evidence that he considers the human mind "fitted for the task of working out for itself" all the truth which the subject requires. It is our opinion that disbelief, in its existing manifestation, is rightly characterized as an attempt to divorce religion from history, even when that respect for Christian facts remains, which the reviewer describes: and we are moreover persuaded, that, in order to escape from the pressure of the Christian claims, historical, in comparison with metaphysical inquiry is disparaged to a degree of which the statements of the reviewer give no idea. Under these convictions, we regard it as a matter of the first importance that the connection of Religion with History which Christianity establishes, should be clearly defined and strenuously insisted upon.

The argument of the essayist is simply this. If the peculiar effects produced by Christianity arose from its historical form, then the religious importance belonging to those effects must be placed to the credit of that form.

To see what the peculiar effects of Christianity were, and how they were produced, our attention is directed to the influence it exerted throughout the Roman empire in the time of Alexander Severus; the circumstances of this period being viewed in connection with the events of the hundred years preceding, as bearing upon that influence. The result of the examination is thus declared.

* Westminster Review, p. 203.

"That the Christian communities did, during the period that we have had in view, make and maintain a protest against the idol-worship of the times, which protest, severe as it was in its conditions, at length won a place in the world for a purer Theology, and set the civilized races free from the degrading superstitions of the Greek Mythology."*

The very purpose for which this result was brought forward, has been mistaken by the reviewer. This is the view he entertains of that purpose.

"If he contemplates clearing these centuries by an argumentative leap; if from the martyr-faith of an age later than the Antonines, he means to conclude the certainty of the Incarnation two hundred years before; then we must say he attempts a logical feat which puts to shame the cautious steps of such reasoners as Paley, Marsh and Whately."†

Now nothing of this kind is contemplated. The object is not to prove the authenticity of the Christian history, by its effects at this period, but to shew from those effects what the *nature of their cause* must have been. So far from the purpose here attributed to him being held by the essayist, it is positively disclaimed on his part.

"What I propose to do in the following pages is not to wrestle with gain-sayers, sincere or insincere, on low levels, nor to tread anew a ground that has already been trodden hard. Work of this sort has been well done; and no one who, in a spirit of industry and honesty, would inform himself concerning the 'Evidences of Christianity,' the 'authenticity and genuineness of the Gospels and Epistles,' or any kindred subjects, need be at a loss in finding books, learnedly and conclusively written, where he may meet with more than enough of proof and argument to satisfy every seriously-minded and educated reader."‡

The moral peculiarity of the effect thus attributed to Christianity is described as follows.

"That in the course of this arduous struggle, and as an unobserved yet inevitable consequence of it, a new Principle came to be recognized, and a new Feeling came to govern the minds of men, which principle and feeling conferred upon the individual man, however low his rank, socially or intellectually, a dignity unknown to classical antiquity, and which yet must be the basis of every moral advancement we can desire or think of as possible."§

The principle here alluded to is the Religious Obligation of Belief.

"The virtue and duty of truthfulness, as between man and man, had been taught, and well enough understood, among ancient nations, whether more or less advanced in civilization. And so had the religious sanctions of morality. That one lesson which remained to be brought out, and to be wrought into the hearts of men, was the *Religious Obligation of Belief*; an obligation not resting upon communities as a public or social charge, but pending with the whole of its weight upon the conscience of the individual man; an obligation personal, a privilege unalienable, and when duly discharged, a function giving the individual man a pledge of his immortality. Until this generative principle should be worked out as an axiom in morals, nothing could be hoped for as to the destinies of the human family. Now that it has been thus worked out, and has been accepted as an axiom, the aspect of human affairs can never be so lowering as that we should despond concerning those destinies. But have we sufficiently regarded the fact, that this great problem was solved for us by the Martyr Church of the century and half now in prospect?"||

* Restoration of Belief, p. 106.

† Westminster Review, p. 177.

‡ Restoration of Belief, p. 23.

§ Ibid. p. 106.

|| Ibid. p. 74.

This representation of the case is substantially conceded by the reviewer.

"In singling out, as one of the grandest practical results of Christianity, the recognition it has obtained for the obligations of religious truth, our author has rightly seized a characteristic distinction of modern from ancient society. The principle is a real agency of the first order in history: we do not accuse him of overrating its importance, but of mistaking its genealogy."*

What is meant by this latter accusation is thus explained.

"We conceive that the moral conditions of the martyr's protest against idol-worship were complete within the limits of Judaism before the mission of Christ; and that the essence of it lies, not in the exclusive characteristics of the gospel, but in the difference between Theistic reverence for a personal Being, and the Pantheistic acknowledgment of an impersonal divineness. The peculiar function of Christianity in this respect was to become missionary to the world of this heroic fidelity transmitted from the parent faith, and hitherto bounded by its limits; and to find a place in the universal conscience of civilized nations for the duty of bearing testimony, though with tortures and death, to the pricelessness of truth and the sanctity of conviction. True it is that the gospel was qualified for this office by directing human faith upon a *Person*; and would have exercised no such power had it been a mere philosophy presenting propositions for assent, instead of a living mind for trust and reverence. But this condition would have been attained by the simple extension of the Jewish Theism. The Personality which is needed as a centre of intense fealty and affection, is found in the God of Hebrew tradition, and for its effects in kindling a martyr courage and constancy, did not require to be sought in the historical Jesus of Nazareth. He, no doubt, as the mediate expression of the Supreme will, as the Being with whom the Church stood in direct contact, as the presence of the Divine in the Human, *was* the object of the disciples' actual allegiance. We do not in the least question this as a *fact*, but only as a *necessity*, ere we can account for the moral features of a martyr age."†

It turns out, then, that the mistake in genealogy does not relate to genealogy at all. The genealogy alleged is true in *fact*; but it was not *necessary* in principle, that the precise genealogy that did exist should have existed. Judaism had previously completed the moral conditions of the problem; therefore Christianity is not to have the exclusive reputation of originating those conditions. Its reputation must be confined to a new application of them.

We suppose the essayist would be quite willing to allow all this; and we are sure that the allowance, instead of injuring, would much strengthen his case. His argument is not intended to contrast Christianity with Judaism, but with Heathenism: and we are not aware that he has laid himself open to attack on the ground of the former contrast. He would, in all probability, contend, that the necessary connection between Christianity and Judaism, gives greater prominence to the doctrine he was desirous of teaching, by illustrating more fully its dependence upon revelation. Having gained this advantage over his opponent, he might go on to plead, that though Judaism had established the conditions of the problem in its own favour, it would not have solved the difficulties with which Christianity had specially to deal. The result occasioned by the latter could not "have been attained by a simple extension of the Jewish Theism." There was an advantage on

* Westminster Review, p. 185.

† Ibid. p. 184.

the side of Christianity, both in principle and degree, with which no mere extension of Judaism would be able to compete. Judaism, by its very construction, was unfitted for other than a local operation, and Christianity was therefore, by its universality, distinguished in principle from it. The personal representation of Christianity was moreover distinguished from any similar representation of Judaism by the far greater degree of sympathy it was calculated to excite. These considerations will prove that the influence conceded to Christianity as a matter of fact, belongs to it as a matter of necessity also; though the necessity may not embrace the *first* employment of that kind of influence. The Christian form in which it appeared was necessary, though it had previously appeared in the world under a Jewish form. The Jewish form would never have fulfilled the Christian work.

Let this be granted, and we may then proceed another step in the direction we are pursuing. Judaism claimed to be a supernatural utterance of the Theism by which it was characterized. It gained its hold upon the belief of its adherents, by virtue of their conviction that its supernaturalism was true. If so, does it not follow, or may it not be reasonably argued, that, in order to gain a similar hold upon mankind in general, Christianity must possess a supernatural authority also? A new sanction would surely be necessary to the new form of Theism required. The necessity for a change in the administration would necessitate a renewal of the credentials by which that administration was authenticated. This seems to us not only very plain, but so consistent with the line of observation adopted by the reviewer himself, that we are almost tempted to give in to his mode of expression, and set down Christianity itself as "the extension of Jewish Theism," which he considers the wants of the case only demanded. It is, indeed, the only possible method, as far as we know, in which such an extension could have been effected. Instead of occupying, on this account, a subordinate place, however, it is thus raised to a position of honour, by virtue of which it assumes to be a direct and original communication of religious truth from God to mankind.

We have, by our last observations, somewhat anticipated the argument we are professing to follow. The next point in advance is this.

"That the struggle whence resulted these two momentous consequences, affecting the welfare of men for ever, was entered upon and maintained on the ground of a definite persuasion or Belief of which a *Person* was the object."*

A distinction is here intended to be drawn between a definite *Belief* and what the essayist calls *Opinion*. This distinction is not drawn very finely any where throughout the Essay, and some unguarded expressions are used with reference to it; but it is nevertheless, as we judge, based upon a correct and important view of the subject. The nature of the distinction may be gathered from such sentences as these:

"The stress of that compulsion which carried so many men, women and youths, through the endurance of tortures, even to death, and which brought so many apostates, pallid and trembling, to the tribunals, there to clear themselves, at the cost of their souls, of the fatal suspicion—this compulsion sprang

* Restoration of Belief, p. 106.

wholly from the perfect conviction they had of the certainty of that *Body of Facts* which constituted and in which consisted their Religious Belief. The Belief of Facts, not an opinion of the truth of principles, was the impulsive cause of that endurance of suffering which we have to consider.”*

“The ground of that Christian fortitude which, in the end, prevailed over the polytheism of the State, was a *Belief* toward a *Person*; it was not an opinion as to doctrine.”†

“It is reasonable, and it is what a good man *must* do, to suffer anything rather than deny a persuasion which is such that he could not, if he would, cast it off. So it was with the early Christian martyrs: their persuasion of the truth of the gospel had become part of themselves: it was faith absolute, in the fullest sense of the word. The same degree of irresistible persuasion attaches to the conclusions of mathematical or physical science; but it never can belong to an opinion or to an undefined abstract belief.”‡

We have to say here, as we said before, that the doctrine attempted to be taught in the paragraphs just quoted, is entirely misunderstood by the reviewer; and we could have well spared a large part of his virtuous indignation in deference to the exercise of a little more carefulness. He transfers what is said on the subject of the *conditions* under which fidelity to conviction is likely to be manifested, to the *obligations* by which such fidelity ought to be enforced.—A mere matter of opinion which is dependent only upon abstract reasoning, will not originate the same tenacity of adherence as a Belief in ascertained facts will do. There is not in the former case the same certainty of persuasion to justify the adherence, as there is in the other.—This is the position of the essayist.—“Our Christian advocate is not content with reserving to his side the sole power of discerning the duty of religious veracity; he further claims the sole right to practise it.”§—That is the interpretation of the reviewer. We have found nothing in the Essay to support this interpretation. There is, indeed, in the Review, a long passage quoted for that purpose, the conclusion of which contains all that is essential to the matter in hand.

“When those who, after rejecting Christianity, talk of suffering for the ‘truth of God,’ and speak as if they were conscience-bound ‘toward God,’ they must know that they not only borrow a language which they are not entitled to avail themselves of, but that they invade a ground of religious belief whereon they can establish for themselves no right of standing. They may indeed profess what *opinion* they please as to the Divine Attributes; but they cannot need to be told, that which the misgivings of their own hearts so often whisper to them, that all such opinions are, at the very best, open to debate, and must always be indeterminate, and that at this time their own possession of the opinion which just now they happen to cling to, is, in the last degree, precarious.”||

“The power of discerning the duty of religious veracity,” and “the right to practise it” also, are not in any manner interfered with by such sentiments as these. The writer of them does not deny to persons who reject Christianity either the responsibility which properly belongs to their own convictions of truth, or the virtue arising from their faithful discharge of that responsibility: what he disputes is this, that the language they employ and the claims they prefer *legiti-*

* Restoration of Belief, p. 66.

† Ibid. p. 77.

‡ Ibid. p. 93.

§ Westminster Review, p. 189.

|| Restoration of Belief, p. 94.

mately belong to the kind of conviction by which they are influenced. He contends that this language and these claims do not express the actually existing state of the case, but are taken from a very different case of conviction with which these persons have no sympathy. He appeals to a condition of things in which a conviction of the same nature as that held by them stood in contrast with that form of religious conviction on whose necessity he insists, and endeavours to shew that the former did not produce the effects produced by the latter. He claims for Christianity the exalted views of religious fidelity which are connected, however conscientiously, with an opposition to Christianity. The error he points out is an error of judgment as to the cause or character of the belief entertained, and not a moral fault involving anything like personal disparagement.

"If I think, or speak," says he, "of any man as an *adversary*, I do so in a sense purely logical; and I do not allow the word to bring with it into my bosom any of those feelings with which, in fact, I regard the *principles* he is endeavouring to establish. These principles I utterly condemn, and the influence he has acquired over the minds of others I would gladly destroy; but toward himself I harbour no unkindly sentiment. How should I do so when I think of him as struggling, without help or hope, in the grasp of perplexities with which every thoughtful and seriously-minded man has had to contend, at some stage of his course, or does still contend with in times of mental lassitude."*

A great deal is said by the reviewer against the manner in which the distinction drawn in the Essay between Faith and Opinion is made to bear upon the relation of Science to Religion. The essayist argues, that the certainty attaching to scientific conclusions brings matters of mere opinion into a discredit which does not relate to matters of fact; and that therefore to connect religion with reasoning only as its support, is to secure its defeat in the contest to which it is destined. The most valuable part of the Review is that which discusses this question; but though we could desire that the truths on which it insists should have modified the statements of the Essay, we are persuaded that the main position assumed in those statements continues unmoved. Let it be granted—that the evidences of Christianity do not possess the kind of certainty that belongs to the demonstrations of science—that no scientific prejudices will be able to destroy reliance upon probable truth—and that the objects on which our spiritual faculties employ themselves are as real as are the phenomena of outward nature. What then? There is still a wide difference between Belief in a Fact and assent to a course of reasoning which gives a degree of certainty to the former that the latter does not possess. Though that certainty is not of the same kind as scientific certainty, it is fitted by the deeper hold it gains upon our moral feelings to exert a rival force, with which no convictions in favour of abstract religious truth can fairly be compared. We need not draw out the proof of this point; for our reviewer has already told us, in honour of the former, of "the difference between Theistic reverence for a personal Being, and the Pantheistic acknowledgment of an impersonal divineness;" and laid it down, "that the gospel was qualified for its office by directing human faith

* Restoration of Belief, p. 9.

upon a Person, and would have exercised no such power had it been a mere philosophy presenting propositions for assent, instead of a living mind for trust and reverence." No more than these admissions is necessary to establish all that the argument before us demands in support of the conclusion, that the historical faith of Christianity constitutes that special superiority on which its influence depends. By that it can satisfy the demands of a scientific age, just as it engaged the trust of an unbelieving one.

We come now to the last position of the Essay under our notice.

"That this belief toward a Person embraced attributes, not only of superhuman excellence and wisdom, but also of superhuman *Power* and *Authority*. If we take the materials before us as our guide, it will not be possible to disengage the history from these ideas of superhuman dignity."*

No attempt is made to prove the supernaturalism of Christianity, that point being professedly reserved as the subject of the succeeding Essay. What we are called upon to mark, is the simple fact, that the religious belief which produced the effects detailed was inseparable from the acknowledgment of supernatural occurrences. It acted as it did by virtue of that element; and we have no reason to suppose that it could have so acted if that element had been wanting.

"If in any instance that can be thought parallel, the concentric testimony of many writers conveys the idea of a clearly-defined Individuality; such an idea, such a conception of a Person, real, and unlike others, *is* conveyed by the evidence now in our hands; and this idea indissolubly blends the *historic* and the *supernatural*; the two elements of character, as combined, possess a force of congruity which compels our submission to it. Whence then came this Idea? We find it on the pages of the early Christian writers in a form so consentient, and it is conveyed in language so sedate and so uniform, that we must believe it to have had *one* source. Much do we meet with in these writers that indicates infirmity of judgment or a false taste; yet does there pervade them a marked simplicity, a grave sincerity, a quietness of tone, when *He* is spoken of whom they acknowledge as Lord. If there be one characteristic of these ancient writings that is *uniform*, it is the calm, affectionate and reverential tone in which the Martyr Church speaks of the Saviour Christ."†

Incidentally, however, some views are developed which do bear upon the nature of the evidence by which miraculous facts may be established. Such is the idea that the general truth of the Christian history may be established, although specific difficulties attaching to that history still remain unexplained.

"When a collection of historic materials, bearing upon a particular series of events, is brought forward, it will follow, upon the supposition that those events have, on the whole, been truly reported, that any hypothesis, the object of which is to make it seem probable that no such events did take place, must involve absurdities which will be more or less glaring. But then *after* the truth of the history has been established, and when the trustworthiness of the materials has been admitted, as we proceed to apply a rigid criticism to ambiguous passages, we shall undoubtedly encounter a crowd of perplexing disagreements; and we shall find employment enough for all our acumen, and trial enough of our patience, in clearing our path. And yet no amount of discouragements such as these will warrant our falling back upon a supposition which we have already discarded as incoherent and absurd."‡

* Restoration of Belief, p. 106.

† Ibid. p. 106.

‡ Ibid. p. 110.

It is certainly a matter of just surprise to find this method of proceeding spoken of as follows.

"We cannot call this a vicious canon of historical criticism; for it simply excludes historical criticism altogether. The critic's work is not a process which can go on generically, without addressing itself to any particular matters at all, and vindicate comprehensive conclusions in blindness towards the cases they comprise. The judgment that, on the whole, a certain book contains a true report of events, can only be a provisional assumption, founded on natural and childlike trust, and can claim no scientific character till it comes out as a collective inference from an investigation in detail of the narrative's contents. . . . As for the great proposition, that 'the gospel of Christ is a supernaturally authenticated gift,' we cannot imagine how it is to be proved *in general*, without research into a single miracle."*

There is not one word said by the essayist to intimate that he supposed the critic's work could "go on generically, without addressing itself to any particular matters at all," or thought the supernaturalism of Christianity could "be proved in general, without research into a single miracle." The very contrary is most clearly implied, when the difficulties alluded to are described as occurring "*after* the truth of the history has been established, and when the trustworthiness of the materials has been admitted."

Then, again, it is not at all correct to affirm of "the judgment that, on the whole, a certain book contains a true report of events," that it "can claim no scientific character till it comes out as a collective inference from an investigation in detail of the narrative's contents." There are other modes of forming this judgment which possess a character no less scientific than the one here mentioned; and we venture to say, that the investigation in detail of the contents of a narrative is not, by any means, the usual scientific method of judging that it contains a true report of events.

Once more: will the reviewer insist that every portion of the contents of a narrative must be correct, before such narrative can be regarded as a true report of events upon the whole? His objection requires this to be the case; for to the full extent to which it is not so, the rule of judgment against which that objection is directed, is not only sustainable, but necessary to be applied.

There is another view of the nature of the evidence advanced in support of the supernatural facts of Christianity, which we think worthy of some attention, though we shall give it in the words of its author, without any comment of our own.

"Is it not reasoning in a circle, thus to believe the miracles because the religion is felt to be from Heaven, and to believe the religion because it has been attested by miracles? Grant it that this *is* a reasoning in a circle, when formally stated; but it does not follow that the reasoning is not good in its substance. A misapprehension on this ground has too easily been admitted, as well on the side of those who have conducted the Christian argument, as with those who have impugned it. A sophism boldly obtruded on the one side, has been timidly dealt with on the other. The very firmest of our convictions come to us in this very same mode—that is, not in the way of a sequence of evidences, following each other as links in a chain, and carrying with them the conclusion; but in the way of the *congruity* of evidences, meeting or collapsing in the conclusion. This is not what is called 'cumu-

* Westminster Review, p. 180.

lative proof,' nor is it proof derived from the coincidence of facts. Those impressions which command the reason and the feelings in the most imperative manner, and which we find it impossible to resist, are the result of the meeting of congruous elements; they are the product of causes which, though independent, are felt so to fit the one to the other, that each, as soon as seen in combination, authenticates the other; and in allowing the two to carry our convictions, we are not yielding to the sophism which consists in alternately putting the premises in the place of each other, but are recognising a principle which is true in human nature. You have to do with one who offers to your eye his credentials—his diploma, duly signed and sealed, and which declares him to be a Personage of the highest rank. All seems genuine in these evidences. At the same time, the style and tone, the air and behaviour, of this Personage, and all that he says, and what he informs you of, and the instructions he gives you, are in every respect consistent with his pretensions as set forth in the Instrument he brings with him. It is not then that you alternately believe his credentials to be genuine, *because* his deportment and his language are becoming to his alleged rank; and then that you yield to the impression which has been made upon your feelings by his deportment, because you have admitted the credentials to be true. Your Belief is the product of a simultaneous accordance of the two species of proof: it is a combined force that carries conviction, not a succession of proofs in line. It is from the same force of congruity, not from a catena of proofs, that we receive the most trustworthy of those impressions upon the strength of which we act in the daily occasions of life; and the same Law of Belief rules us also in the highest of all arguments—that which issues in a devout regard to *Him*, by and through Whom are all things. On this ground, where logic halts, an instinctive reasoning prevails, which takes its force from the confluence of reasons.”*

Let us now re-state the conclusion to which this series of positions naturally conducts. The reviewer says, that the positions are unsailable; “but they lie so completely out of the field of modern doubt and controversy, that he is at a loss to imagine what possible use the author can make of them.” We do not feel ourselves at this loss. Modern doubt and controversy relate to the Historical form in which Christianity sets forth religious truth. The argument we have been considering proves that this form is valid, both in itself, and as embracing the peculiar conditions with which Christianity connects it. If that argument be defensible, then it is to the historical representations which Christianity makes, that its religious effects are to be attributed. The necessity of the representation is proportioned to the value of those effects. It does not follow, that because the martyrs of the Church, at the period under review, believed in the miraculous facts of Christian history, therefore those facts were true; but it does follow, that the spiritual advantages involved in their martyrdom could not have been produced except in connection with their faith. That faith is thus lifted to a moral elevation which confers upon it the utmost conceivable importance; and having gained such an elevation in our judgments, it affords a strong presumption, the strongest indeed of which the case admits, that the facts of Christianity really happened, as they are in the Christian books declared to have happened.

“Remove from Christianity everything in it which is supernatural and divine, and then the problem which we have to do with is this:—A revolution in human affairs, in the highest degree beneficial in its import, was carried

* Restoration of Belief, p. 102.

forward upon the arena of the great world, by means of the noble behaviour of men who command our sympathy and admiration, as brave, wise and good. But this revolution drew the whole of its moral force from a Belief which—how shall we designate it?—was in part an inexplicable illusion; in part a dream; and in large part a fraud! This, the greatest forward movement which the civilized branches of the human family have ever made, took its rise in bewildered Jewish brains! Indestructible elements of advancement, to which even infidel nations confessedly owe whatever is best and most hopeful within them,—these elements of good, which were obtained for us at so vast a cost, had their source in a congeries of exaggerations, and in a mindless conspiracy, hatched by chance, nursed by imposture, and winged by fanaticism.”*

Γ.

MONEY AND MORALS.†

THE view of Socialism taken by Mr. Lalor in his 7th chapter, entitled “Working Partnerships,” is both kindly and wise. “Socialism,” he says, “is a delusion. It is necessary to oppose it, but it is folly to depise it” (p. 194). He is therefore favourable to a reform in the law of partnership, assimilating it to that which already exists in France and the United States; allowing in certain cases of partnerships with limited liability, and establishing some cheaper and more energetic tribunal of appeal for joint-stock companies than the Court of Chancery. The following passage is a statement of an important fact, not generally known or appreciated :

“There are some who think that this contagion, the spread of which has done much to undermine the fabric of continental society, is not at all to be dreaded in England; and that the instinctive good sense of English workmen must always protect them from such a delusion. The superior practical sense of the English workman is indeed a real and most fortunate distinction; but an error which can obtain dominion over such minds as those of the highly-educated advocates of Socialism in England, may very easily assume shapes which, under favourable circumstances, would spread it far and wide amongst the working class. There is, moreover, a peculiarity about working-class politics which is frequently lost sight of, but is of the highest importance—and that is, the love which they have for abstract and elementary discussion. The political shopkeeper takes as keen an interest in the differences between Lord John Russell and Lord Derby, as if he himself were either hoping to gain or fearing to lose some ministerial appointment. The politician of the workshop cares not a rush for either of the great leaders. He is well convinced that they are both aristocrats and enemies of the people. The topics which he deems worthy of discussion are such as the right of property in land, the hostile claims of labour and capital; and, in short, his intellect is perpetually loosening up one or other of the foundations of society. What can be a greater mistake than to imagine that there is not here a soil, all ready prepared, for a general and rapid upgrowth of Socialism, whenever a man shall arise who knows how to turn the capacity to account, and chooses to cast in the seed?”—Pp. 198, 199.

And therefore Mr. Lalor, as we think wisely, recommends that such concessions as we have above indicated should be made to the Socialistic impulse; and that if any enthusiastic persons should wish

* Restoration of Belief, p. 109.

† Continued from p. 565.

to try the experiment of Socialism on a larger scale, they should be met with such fair play and even encouragement, as should render the consequent failure, which he regards as inevitable, both signal and undoubted.

We are again painfully at issue with our author in his 8th and 9th Chapters—entitled respectively, “England among the Nations,” and “National Defences.” The tone of his opinions is rendered ominously evident by the well-known quotation from Richard II. which he places at the head of the former:

“England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious surge
Of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame.”

The shame consists in the fact, that at the beginning of the present year certain statesmen reprobated the freedom of speech employed by our leading journals with reference to the French coup d'état of the preceding December. Our own sympathies were, it is true, strongly in favour of the newspapers; but we cannot, with Mr. Lalor, call the conduct of Lord Derby and others, “a humiliation such as is without precedent in the history of England, and such as one must pray may not happen to her again,” nor draw from it such grave conclusions. “Eminent English citizens,” he says, “became suddenly *afraid* to utter openly in the face of foreign nations” the convictions which they had formed on the conduct of Louis Napoleon. The general feeling of the English people was, however, one of energetic indignation. But then the direction of public feeling was changed.

“Soon a new thought occurred, scarcely perceptible at first, so vague and unsubstantial did it seem; but, creeping and spreading, at last it rose up; then, like the mist turning into a genie, in the Eastern tale, suddenly became solid, and burst upon the eye in a form at once distinct, gigantic, and awful. That thought was, that the position of England herself was totally changed by the event which had taken place in France. As the new light broke upon them, men wondered how a thing so plain should have been even for a moment doubtful. The power of France—a power more solid, compact, sustained, and far more fresh than in the days of Jena and Austerlitz—was now concentrated, and in what hands?—In the hands of a man wholly indebted to the army for his elevation—a man likely to be tempted by the strongest motives to gratify the passions of that army, and to find for it the work which it would like best. But then, perhaps, of a man, who, from early training and personal inclination, was unlikely to launch that fiery mass of impatient valour against England? In the hands of a man who, if he did not suck in antipathy to England with his mother's milk, had at least been brought up, and had lived to maturity, in the passionate hope of restoring that power which the hand of England had struck down—a man who, in prison and in exile, had fed his mind upon this thought,—brooding over it in solitude—not losing hold of it in society—the mental eye often picturing visions of empire when the hand seemed busy with the cue or the dice-box,—and who, at one of the most solemn and critical occasions of his life, had avowed it to be his long-cherished purpose to wipe away the stain of Waterloo. Still, perhaps, of a man feeble in character, and incapable of dangerous designs? No; all was in the hands of a man whose strength of will, power of concealing enmity with smiles, patience in abiding his time, and decisive promptitude in execution when the time came, had just been shown to the amaze of Europe, in taking up out of his path, like children, the wisest statesmen and the most vigorous and experienced generals of France. Such was the new power which in an instant, in the twinkling of

an eye, had raised its front of calm and silent menace in view of the shores of England. How was she prepared, if called upon, to meet it? She felt instinctively for her weapons, and if she could have felt dismay, then was the time. It would serve no purpose to go into an enumeration of the old guard-ships, the remote and inaccessible squadrons and regiments, the dismounted artillery-trains, and the troops dispersed as police throughout the United Kingdom. It is enough to say, that, according to the belief of many, not apt to give way to causeless fears, a French army might then have been landed on the south coast, and might have commemorated, by an inscription on Waterloo Bridge, its occupation of the capital of England."—Pp. 211, 212.

Mr. Lalor's estimate of the danger of invasion from the side of France is, then, not small. He goes on to enumerate our risks. "British interests and British commerce are scattered literally all over the globe;" and their protection has hitherto consisted in the fact, that a boast equivalent to *Civis Romanus sum*, has never hitherto lacked support from Woolwich and Portsmouth. But "ominous signs * * have been frequent of late that this charm is passing away." Our missions are as worthy of diplomatic guardianship as our commerce, and exposed to danger even more imminent. Commerce and missions can be protected, justice between nations ensured, only by the fact "that the scratch of a pen at Whitehall should always be sufficient to move line of battle ships from their moorings, and launch them into the deep, manned, organized and armed with all the machinery of destruction, as complete as skill and discipline and valour can make it" (p. 221). Unjust demands may be made upon us. "How long will absolute governments," such as now sway the destinies of Europe, "patiently endure the sharp comments of the English press?" An English minister was once able to return a calm negative answer to the angry demands of Napoleon the Great on this head; but why? "Only because the ships of the Nile were at hand, and the flag of Nelson ready to go to the mast-head." Then there is the right of asylum, which we may be called upon to defend at any moment. We have treaties by which we must stand, and ought to be ready, for example, to prevent by force of arms any attempt on the part of France to occupy Belgium. If we do not form strong and well-defined continental alliances, the "decline in the continental influence of England, which has been long in progress, will soon reach its final term;" and "from the loss of respect to the infliction of humiliation, the transition is neither long nor difficult."

Such is a brief resumé of Mr. Lalor's views on the position of England among the nations. National defences are his remedy. We are behindhand with regard to the weapons and munitions of war. "The Admiralty is now the most important department of the English Government," and "beyond all question that department does require reform—radical reform." Then, too, the House of Commons must learn to treat the Navy Estimates in a very different spirit, and sink the consideration of economy in the question of efficiency. We want men who can use the tools. "Militia is better than nothing, but regular troops much better than militia." Our new battalions must be disciplined; our artillery increased in force; a mode of manning our ships devised; and our commands entrusted, not to the oldest, but the ablest officers. On all these subjects Mr. Lalor enters into

very full explanations and arguments. Could we follow him through the whole train of his thought, we might notice many statements which we think controvertible, but the length to which this article has already run warns us to be brief.

The most specific danger to which, in the opinion of Mr. Lalor and other alarmists, we are exposed, is that of invasion from France. Of this, as will appear from the extract above quoted, he speaks in terms sufficiently definite. We have as little confidence as Mr. Lalor can have in the morale either of Louis Napoleon, or of those generals who have most influence with the French army. We do not believe that, if he thought it politic and felt himself able to do it, the Prince President would scruple to repay the hospitality which he has received from England, with invasion and bloodshed. Is it then in his power? His army is indeed unprecedentedly large. Yet it appeared but the other day, from an official report of the state of the navy, that a very small number of sail of the line were all that could be collected from the French harbours and stations even in case of the direst emergency; while the splendid fleets of the Cunard, West-India, and Peninsular and Oriental Companies, compared with the French steamers, few in number and small in size, which navigate the Mediterranean, ought to quiet all reasonable apprehensions as to the relative strength of the steam marine of the two countries. But then war requires money. The commercial classes of France, and the large number who subsist on small funded incomes, have accepted Louis Napoleon, and bear his yoke with an equanimity at which the finger of scorn is pointed on this side the channel, on the express ground that social tranquillity, however ensured, is more advantageous than anarchy to the interests of property. No measure which raises taxes and depresses public securities can long be popular with them. That the proposal of war emanated from a Bonaparte, would be sufficient to render it distasteful to such of the old landed aristocracy as still linger in their ancestral chateaux. And though the small proprietor and the peasantry might for a time throw up their caps and shout for vengeance on perfide Albion, men whose little holdings are mortgaged at seven per cent. for sums far exceeding their real value, will soon be clamorous for peace. France cannot afford war; and if so ill-advised, or transported by military ardour, as to commence hostilities without counting the cost, does not possess the naval resources requisite for striking a blow, of which we should not be abundantly forewarned.

One remark more we would make on the general question of "England among the Nations." We grant that on the continent neither England nor Englishmen can be said to be popular. Wherever despotism has succeeded in stifling the germs of constitutional liberty, it is hardly to be expected that the inhabitants and representatives of a country which is the propaganda of self-government should be treated with cordiality or attention. But to believe that, because the Austrian police are churlish in granting passports to English travellers, Austria is likely to demand the suppression of the *Daily News*, or the extradition of Kossuth, and to dispatch Marshal Haynau against us, if the demands be not granted, is to display a total misapprehension of the relative capabilities of the two nations. We have for some years past—thanks, in part, to the much-reviled commercial spirit—gradu-

ally acquired the habit of settling our little differences with our neighbours otherwise than at the sword's point; but were it not so, the petty annoyances to which Englishmen travelling on the continent have of late been subject (we speak not of particular cases), are hardly just cause for the withdrawal of ambassadors and the manning of fleets. However hurt we may feel, we do not knock down an old friend and neighbour, should he accost us in the street with somewhat less than his usual affability of demeanour. But suppose matters to proceed to extremities,—from which side is the danger to come? The case of France we have already disposed of. Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, and the smaller German states, we may class as necessarily harmless. Belgium and Holland are our old allies, and united to us by the strongest ties. Austria has a fleet, but is overloaded with debt, in daily danger of national bankruptcy, and the danger still more imminent of social anarchy. Should Prussia turn against us, she has but two frigates at command. Half-a-dozen ships at the Sound, and as many at the Dardanelles, would be sufficient to keep the Russian Autocrat—whose last war was undertaken with English money—within the boundaries of his own empire. America cannot at the present moment protect her own fisheries, without at the same time giving up her hydrographical expedition to Japan. We do not believe that there is now a single European nation which, so far from courting war with so powerful a state as our own, has not enough, and more than enough, to do at home.

The length to which our remarks have already extended, prevents us from entering into anything like a discussion of the third and concluding portion of Mr. Lalor's work, which he entitles, "Path to the Remedy." The first part of it is devoted to an examination of various theories of social progresses, and the consideration of the question—Is the civilized world, and especially England, advancing or receding in regard to that moral progress, apart from which material progress can only be considered as a misfortune? Had we time, we should have joined issue with Mr. Lalor on the inference which he draws from various signs of the times, and endeavoured to prove that a more kindly and hopeful appreciation of our present state might be justified by the facts of the case. But admitting, with him, the existence of evils enough, though perhaps not to so great an extent, we are content to let him develop his remedy in his own words—words which need from us no expression of hearty assent and approbation to recommend them to the reader.

"But what should we do that such evils may not come upon us? The remedy is plain: no legislative nostrum, no ingenious device of the Socialist projector, for enabling evil hearts to carry out the Divine law—no novel stimulant to make an empty life supportable; no, something homely, old and familiar, but often tried in individual cases, and always found effectual—PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY. This is the subject, the marrow of the whole. Those who have followed thus far will not be surprised to find themselves at this centre. Those who do no more than hastily strike open a leaf, should not judge rashly whether it be well or ill done to touch at all on this highest matter. Above all, let no one who may have joined with interest in the analysis of a difficult problem in economics, think that, that once completed, the rest might have been spared; that the work is good, and would have been welcome, but the appendix impertinent; for indeed this is no appendix, but

rather that which was designed to be the substance of the work. The economical analysis was no more than the dissecting of a dead body, a task disclosing many beautiful adaptations, but, upon the whole, repulsive, and only to be undertaken in the hope of getting at some life-giving truth."—P. 291.

And, speaking of Mr. Carlyle's doctrine of Hero-worship, Mr. Lalor remarks,

"No, if we wait for the heroes, we shall do nothing. If we choose them for ourselves, it will happen, as it did in the old paganism, that the idol will reflect the weaknesses of the worshipper. But happily there is no need to wait. The choice is already made. It was made by a higher than human wisdom, when, more than eighteen hundred years ago, a DIVINE LIFE was exhibited in a human form, and mingled for ever with the general life of humanity. Then was laid the only foundation for all human reforms and all human hopes. That is what I believe. I am not ashamed to wear what have been called those 'Hebrew old clothes.' I believe that they never will grow old. But the proof? The proof lies in the fact, patent to every eye, that this, and this only, *has* been the regenerating influence in the history of the world. Except this, the Greeks had everything—philosophy, poetry, history, eloquence, art—and all could not avert decay. If decay is now to be averted, this Christian faith alone can do it. It is this which *is* doing the saving work, so far as it is done, even now. While philanthropists are planning in their easy chairs—while philosophers are speculating, economists calculating, and statesmen making laws—those true ministers of Christ who shew his spirit in their lives, whether they be or be not marked out by formal ordination, are actually, in the abodes of poverty and ignorance and sorrow, carrying on that process of individual personal communication, without which nothing effectual is accomplished for the moral redemption of mankind."—Pp. 295, 296.

Again, after exhorting his readers to seek for Christian evidences in the lives of Christians, Mr. Lalor proceeds to say,

"Numbers would heartily concur in this practical conclusion, who will recoil and fly off to all points of the compass from the inference to which it inevitably leads. That inference is, that this argument, decisive as it is in behalf of Christianity, is worthless in support of the exclusive pretensions of any one church. It will not make out the case of the Church of Rome against the Church of England, nor of the Church of England against the Church of Rome, nor serve in the least degree to sustain any one of the forms of Dissenting infallibility. It follows that Christianity must be looked at, not as some one sect *would* have it, but as the world actually *has* had it. The warfare against it has been moved off to new ground. The old bulwarks are built up in a quarter where the contest no longer rages. That work of defence which was carried on before by isolated and mutually hostile champions, will no longer avail, if it cannot be conducted on some principle of combination. The basis of any successful defence against the modern scepticism must be the *conception of Christianity in its historical integrity*. It did not dive under ground, as has been sometimes supposed, for ten centuries, nor abandon for that long period the great active life of Europe to take refuge in the caves and hiding-places of the Paulicians and Albigenses. It was there throughout, blended always with more or less of human error and weakness, but still alive and potent in Hildebrand himself as certainly as in Luther. One cannot survey the churches of Great Britain at the present day without seeing that those works which are the fruits and the proofs of faith do in fact proceed from *all* of them. This is no reason why any one church should yield what it believes to be truth, or accept what it believes to be error; but it is a reason why all the criminations and malignities of controversy should be at once and for ever abandoned. Externally, and in their exclusive aspect, all the churches are repulsive. Internally, and in their Christian aspect, all are beautiful. Let

every man be held disqualified for sectarian controversy, until all that is angry and impure and selfish in his nature has been purged away. Let the desire for reform be everywhere turned within, and then that inner beauty of the churches would all come out, and the whole visible front of Christianity would become radiant like the ranks of the celestial host, by which in the great English epic the power of Evil is overthrown."—Pp. 297, 298.

It is pleasant thus to part with an author, with whom one has had grounds of difference, on a spot consecrated only to kindness and goodwill. Mr. Lalor, so long accustomed efficiently to discharge the arduous duties of a critic, will pardon us that we have dealt candidly with what appear to us the faults and mistakes of his book. It was hardly to be expected that he and any of his critics should be able to agree in all parts of a train of thought leading to topics so many and so various: and when those topics involve important social truths and principles, he is the honestest critic who speaks his mind with least hesitation and circumlocution. And we would conclude, as we began, by tendering our thanks to Mr. Lalor for having given us an earnest and a truthful book, on a subject which pre-eminently demands earnestness and truthfulness. The conclusions of political economy would soon find their practical application to the wants of English life, if all our political philosophers added to their mental acumen the moral qualities of authorship so obviously displayed in "*Money and Morals*."

C.

THE ENGLISH PASSION FOR IMPROVEMENT.

THOUGH animal organization is beyond the constructive skill of man, he takes the elements existing in nature, and by new combinations gets new power. He keeps adding to the qualities of his noblest coursers, his fleetest dogs, and his goodliest bees. He year by year develops the resources of the soil—reclaims the marsh from wild fowl, the heath from rabbits, and the flinty hill-side from briars and thistles. He goes on multiplying the blades of grass and grains of corn, and compels an equal area to yield a twofold increase. He discovers in his raw materials unsuspected properties, until soda and sand are converted into a Crystal Palace, and water, coal and stony ore into a train which rushes with the might of an earthquake and the velocity of the wind. He devises fresh applications of machinery, and in the creations of his ingenuity finds a servant and a master. The broad result to England is quickly told. Fifty years have doubled the population, and employment and subsistence have been doubled likewise. An engine is contrived which economizes labour, and threatens starvation to the labourer; but the issue proves that the work it makes is more than it saves. Annihilate all the cranks and wheels constructed in the interval, and return our counties, with their present population, to the condition in which they were when the century began, and there would be nothing but famine in the land. A government wiser than man's has provided, in the constant exertion of talent, for the increase of our race, and maintains a proportion between our wants and our progress. Every round we rise in the ladder leads to a higher; but our step is limited, and we should outstrip our needs by too prodigious a stride, and encroach on the rights of a future age.—*Quarterly Review*.

PICTURES FROM GENESIS. No. II.

THE GARDEN OF EDEN, OR THE ANCIENT JEWISH THEORY OF EVIL.

(Gen. ii. 8—iii. 24.)

M. I think myself that Paradise was in Asia, certainly.

A. I dare say it was.

M. You are not interested in the subject?

A. No, uncle; or rather I do not mind reading those books. Paradise is not so lost as is sometimes thought. The Garden of Eden is now spread out into the width of the world. Our homes are bowers in it; our roads are walks in it; and always within reach hang forbidden fruits, though now they are such as are often their own punishment in the eating,—apples of Sodom, golden in the rind and dust inside. There is in the Garden still the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and this we may eat of now; for it is full grown, and the fruit of it is ripe. And by eating of it, we too have our eyes opened, and so are able to recognize, as the very tree of life, what otherwise looks deadly, and itself dead wood; I mean the tree of the crucifixion.—*Euthanasy*, p. 71.

To the reflecting and religious mind, which has already traced God in the outward creation, the Moral world next opens a wider and more difficult field of inquiry.

Man is, to man's own reasoning mind, the great problem of all,—the masterpiece, yet the mystery, of all God's works. His powers, his condition, his duties, his prospects,—what? and whence? and why?

Chief among his inquiries into his own being and condition, stands the eternal question of EVIL. It meets him everywhere,—never fully answered, ever recurring. Evil, natural and moral,—sin and misery,—whence and why are they? Is the one to be regarded as the cause of the other, and that other as its punishment? A simple theory; but is it accordant with fact? Is human suffering simply and solely, uniformly and proportionately, the penalty of sin? If so, were these appointed from the first, by the great Creator, to make part in the human lot? Were they originally inherent in our nature and condition? And if so, why (with reverence be it asked)—why was man thus formed and circumstanced by a benevolent Creator? Or, was human nature free from these plagues at first; and were they incurred, imported, engrafted upon it, afterwards? And if so, how?

These are questions which have occupied the mind of every thinker in every age. They are questions on which there is room enough for thinking yet.

The unknown, very ancient, writer of this second section of the Book of Genesis, has left us his earnest thoughts towards their solution, in his picture of the Garden of Eden. I would make myself simply the expositor of his thoughts,—the thoughts, doubtless, of many besides him in his own and subsequent days, but very different (as will be obvious to the careful student) from the ideas now generally prevalent and believed to be founded upon this history of Eden. We need not take his venerable musings as a creed for ourselves, nor be anxious to reconcile them with existing beliefs. But let us try to find out what he himself, that early religious thinker, believed.

The intelligent and devout mind, reflecting earnestly upon its own emotions and upon the conduct of others, contemplating the mixed good

and evil of human actions, characters and motives,—now nobly exulting in its conscious power of virtuous action and high resolve, but again the more acutely ashamed for the degradation and vices of human life, and confessing, even in its own virtuous consciousness of resistance, that the seeds of frailty are in itself, as partaking that same nature which sometimes rises to angels and sometimes sinks below brute natures,—pondering these things, the thoughtful and religious mind has more than whispered a doubt whether the moral faculties and free-agency of man are, on the whole, a blessing to his existence, or a curse. If, when rightly used, exalted and improved, they give him enjoyments such as no other creature on God's earth can know; perverted, they sting him with misery and plunge him into degradation unknown to any creature not similarly endowed. And if, in the reveries of thought, the best state of human happiness is sometimes imagined as that which should be simply free from these dark evils of the perverted moral nature; if the mind, while musing on the dark side of human actions, forgets to consult the brighter; ay, if in the infancy of human society no adequate idea could be formed of the adaptation of the human powers for perpetual growth and improvement, and of the necessity of their exposure to evil in order to the development of their good,—then, it must have been very natural for the musing moralist to give his preference to the idea of a state of simple innocence, void of virtuous action and endurance, above that of mixed virtue and vice which actual life presents. And this train of thought might lead him to wish that the perilous gift of reasoning choice could be recalled, and instinct sufficient for the purposes of the lower life be given instead. Without adopting such a view of man, we can understand it and sympathize with it as held by earlier thinkers on these difficult questions.

Then, again, when it is seen how many of the miseries of human life plainly arise out of human errors and misconduct, it is easy (yet very rash) to conclude (as was the very prevalent conclusion of ancient moralists, and is a not uncommon opinion with the moderns) that all the sufferings and evils of human life, without exception, are to be referred to this cause—that the natural evil in the world is altogether the penalty and punishment of moral evil. To maintain this theory, some resolute self-closing of the eyes to the facts of the case is indeed necessary, and some confounding of the principle of personal responsibility and retribution; but the theory has widely prevailed.

Having arrived thus far, the moral speculator wanted but one step further back,—a great and hazardous one, with little but conjecture to guide him in taking it, namely, How came moral evil—sin? The sufferings of life being ascribed (truly or not) to the vices of human beings, whence came those vices? How came man to do wrong?

The plain answer is, From that freedom of choice which man has and which he abuses; from his partial “knowledge of good and evil” (his moral faculty), and from his imperfect compliance even with that knowledge, his imperfect obedience to conscience.

Then, whence or why this “knowledge of good and evil”—this moral faculty? was the ultimate question in the mind of the philosopher who had thus reasoned. Was man thus endowed with moral perceptions at first by his Creator? And was it then a good and benevolent gift of his Creator to him? Or, was man created differently, without the

moral faculty, in the first instance? And did he afterwards, in contravention of his Maker's wiser and kinder will, become possessed of these perilous powers, by which he has conscience of good and evil? And if so, how? And why did a kind Providence permit him to gain what Creation had mercifully denied him?

The chronicler of the Garden of Eden has chosen the latter alternative. Deeming this moral nature of man a gift to be deprecated rather than desired, he has believed that the Almighty originally created man without it. He would not ascribe to the Creator the direct bestowal of those moral powers upon man which are so liable to perversion, and are so often perverted to worst abuse. He represents them as jealously withheld by Heaven, yet stealthily obtained by Man.

The difficulty is thus only removed a step: it is not got rid of. But more could not be done without the aid of Christian light and love; and even they cannot solve the mighty problem of Evil completely. The Hebrew sage could only push it back. Having rashly granted that the moral nature of man is a curse to him rather than a blessing, he will not ascribe it *directly* to the Creator, as his original gift, but he is still forced to allow that the Creator made man in such a manner that he would inevitably attain the perilous boon of knowing good from evil. God, he admits, gave sight and smell and taste, and presented a tree of delightful attractiveness to all these senses. He gave a quicker sensitiveness to the womanly perceptions of Eve, vivacity to her imagination, and curiosity to her desires; and though the command, "Thou shalt not eat thereof," had been laid upon the man, there could be (by the theory) no knowledge of the good of obedience or the evil of contrary inclination, before he had eaten of that very "tree of the knowledge of good and evil." Providence permitting and arranging this, was equivalent to the Creator's endowing him thus at first; or rather, he must have been thus endowed, to some extent, from the first, to have sinned as he did. To have been qualified to understand a command, and guilty in breaking it, implies to a certain extent the possession of moral faculties, the knowledge of good and evil. So essentially do they belong to man, in his very nature as man, that the very theory which tries to explain their acquisition tacitly assumes their previous existence. On his own principles, then, the writer has but removed or disguised the difficulty, not solved it. But he has done his best, and has given us a rich and earnest vein of thought.

Let us, then, look into the details of his theory. We must notice first what those evils of human life are which the writer thinks it necessary to account for, and then see how he considers them to have been produced.

The natural evils enumerated are, those of toil and pain, the necessity of clothing, and the liability to death.

First comes the necessity of toil as the condition of human subsistence. Labour is an undoubted law of the human condition in general. But any one who calmly reflects upon its influence in the exercise and development of the human powers and character, will scruple at least before he pronounces it a curse to man. Yet the sacred writer has so represented it,—as an unmitigated curse, a vindictive punishment. Perhaps the nature of the Eastern climate and the habits of quiet contemplativeness on the one hand, and easy indolence and luxury on the

other, may go far to account for this feature in the Paradise of the traditionary earthly Past,—a feature which Mahomet (likewise in the spirit of Eastern life) transferred to his Paradise of the future world. Adam was, indeed, according to the legend, not quite exempt from labour from the first. Before his disobedience, he was placed in the garden and enjoined “to dress it and to keep it;” which is an unwitting testimony to the necessity of *occupation* at least for man, as the first condition of happiness. But, after his sin, the dressing and keeping that devolves upon him is made laborious, instead of being merely pleasant and easy. The ground is cursed for his sake. Thorns and thistles are thenceforth to grow from it. He is to exchange the garden of Eden for the rougher field of the world, and to eat his bread in the sweat of his face and with sorrow of heart.

And while bodily labour, regarded as the prevailing hardship of man, is thus accounted for, the bodily pains most grievous and peculiar to woman are referred to the same explanation, together with her subjection (natural and necessary to a certain degree, and Eastern to a much greater extent) to the stronger hand and usually more resolute will of the other sex. Here, again, we may well doubt the solution offered for the evident facts. In those severe, though transient and rare, pains, connected as they are with the strong instinct of maternal love, we may read, if we are disposed, under the suggestion of the sacred words of Jesus Christ himself (John xvi. 21), a blessing rather than a curse. And many an affectionate woman’s heart will confess also, from its depth of trusting dependence, a blessing rather than a curse in the sentence, “Thy desire shall be subject to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” But the writer is at least consistent, while poetically imaginative, in his theory; for he has selected from the condition of the woman the correlative features to that of bodily toil in the lot of man.

The necessity of clothing, a want peculiar to mankind among all the creatures of God in this world, and confessed as the dictate of a sense of delicacy where not enforced by the rigours of cold or heat, is another human want here designated a curse or punishment. And if labour is indeed a curse, this perpetual need of clothing, which is one of the chief demands upon labour, is the perpetuation of the curse. With it is joined the need of dwellings; and the supply of these two wants involves, in most countries, a greater exertion of labour than the production of food. Yet we hesitate to call this an evil, when we find how closely the arts which supply clothing and dwellings are connected with the progress of civilization and of virtue.

Death, the lot of all, is the other great physical evil which the writer would account for. An evil, indeed, it must be confessed, in proportion as life is a good, if this life were all that is intended for us. The ancient moralist, knowing nothing beyond this life and scarcely venturing to conjecture, could not but regard death as a sore evil; and he has expressed himself accordingly. It was the penalty of transgression. From that moment *the human race became mortal*; the evident meaning of the penalty, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” I am not quite sure that I apprehend his exact idea as to what would have been the lot of the first human pair if they had not eaten

of the forbidden knowledge. But "the tree of life," he tells us, was in the midst of the garden, and there was no prohibition uttered against eating of that tree. Our first parents might, for anything that appears to the contrary, have eaten of the tree of life, thus perpetuating their existence indefinitely, so long as they abstained from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Man might, apparently, according to the theory of this author, have lived immortally in Paradise, had he remained content without the knowledge of right and wrong. A questionable Paradise! An immortality not to be coveted by the full-grown man in Jesus Christ! But it is a harmless theory of what *might have been*, but *was not*. Our first parents had not, before they disobeyed, secured an earthly immortality. And now, when the desire comes through their knowledge of good and evil, they are shut out from the possibility of reaching it.

If these thoughts on the evils to which man is subject are vague and unsatisfactory, let us only ask ourselves, How could human reasonings be otherwise, while the secrets of the grave lay unrevealed? Jew and Greek, Philosopher and Heathen, alike, marvelled over the problem of life and death, understanding neither, because they could not see the light beyond both.

Such are, however, the natural evils of the human condition, which the tradition of Paradise endeavours to account for. And the explanation attempted undoubtedly is, that of representing them as the punishment upon our first parents for having acquired the power of moral perception, the forbidden faculty of knowing right from wrong. It regards these natural evils, of toil on the part of man, and pain and subjection on that of woman, and the nakedness of both, and, chief of all, their common liability to death, as the result of their having gained, contrary to the Divine command, "the knowledge of good and evil." We need not further pursue the explanation thus attempted, as we noticed at the beginning of our remarks how the whole theory proceeds essentially upon a desponding and distrustful view of human nature, or at least upon an inactive love of ease, and implies the impression that man had better be devoid of his highest characteristic as a moral agent, than possess such powers subject to the liability of their abuse, the necessary condition of his finite nature.

If man is raised above the brutes, by what part of his constitution is it, unless by his moral faculties, his knowledge of good and evil? Perilous gift indeed! but noble, glorious, godlike! Fit gift for the Almighty Father's love to bestow at first, and not grudgingly to see afterwards obtained against his design and will! Against his design and will? How were that, indeed, possible? Yet the chronicler of the Garden of Eden makes Jehovah God exclaim, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." As though HE were jealous of his own creatures! In a higher spirit by far does the author of the first song of the Creation declare, that when God made this earth, "He created man in his own image, after his likeness;" and how in his own image, if he were wanting the most godlike of his faculties?

In brief, then, while we must look with deep interest and sincere respect, it need not be with blind credulity, upon this fragment of the

Garden of Eden, as preserving some of the earliest thoughts of the most serious thinkers in patriarchal times, on the still unexhausted problem of the existence of Evil in the world.*

But whatever we may think of the theory of human nature and the system of moral philosophy (so to call it) here attempted, the Garden of Eden meets our purest religious sympathy in the view which it otherwise gives of the *character of the Supreme Being*; in which aspect the student of Divine Revelation may find, I believe, a strong and very interesting argument for the reality of Divine interpositions for the religious instruction of mankind in the earliest times, long before the dispensation by Moses.

The character of God, as depicted in the song of Eden, is most truly paternal and endearing. Those spiritual and exalted attributes, indeed, which make an essential part of any pure and worthy conception of God, are not here depicted. In the Garden of Eden the beneficent Deity himself walks with Adam and converses with him; and Adam hears his voice; and as he has often heard it before in innocence and with gladness, so now with the fear of conscious guilt he hears it, and thinks to hide himself from his Creator's sight. Now all this is, in one aspect, quite unworthy of a Christian's conception of God. If we were seeking the Christian theology here, we must seek in vain. But this, which we find in Genesis, does not profess to be a Christian con-

* It is due to our subject here to remark how entirely different the doctrine of Genesis is from the commonly-received notions of the Fall of Man, which are perseveringly declared to lie at the basis of revealed religion. Those notions are defined in the creeds of Churches and embodied in the poetry of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, but they are not in the song of Eden itself.

The common doctrine of the Fall implies that man had the sense of right and wrong previously, and that he abused it. The book of Genesis says (confusedly indeed and inconsistently, we grant) that he first gained that sense of right and wrong by the act of eating the forbidden fruit. The common doctrine says, that Adam's posterity all sinned in him. The book of Genesis only says they all became mortal in him, and subject to pain and toil and want. And, most flagrantly of all (not to particularize further), the common doctrine introduces, as the prime agent in the scene, a being never alluded to in the scriptural account of the fall of Adam, and belonging apparently to a much later period of Jewish theology. Quite gratuitously, the common notion ascribes to a supposed evil spirit that which the scriptural writer—whether as a mere poetical fancy or as a distinct opinion—ascribes to the Serpent, “the most subtle of all the *beasts of the field*,” without the slightest hint as to the existence or agency of a Satan or Devil. The Serpent is the only tempter spoken of; whose destination to crawl in the dust is accounted for as having been his punishment, implying (as the pictures in certain old Bibles appropriately, though grotesquely, represent the writer's evident idea) that the serpent was originally formed with legs and feet like the other “*beasts of the field*,” of which he is spoken of as one.

Between this early speculation on the Origin of Evil and the modern doctrine of the Fall and its consequences, there is, in short, no connection, no coherence, no similarity. Let none object to my exposition as not making Genesis to be literally true: I am more scriptural (whether orthodox or not) than the most orthodox believer in the fall of Adam. He does not inculcate a belief in the doctrine of the book of Genesis, but makes that ancient book speak his comparatively modern ideas, and then bids us believe his theology on the credit of Moses. I have endeavoured to trace what the writer really does say and does mean, and have asked my readers to receive it in the spirit of ancient research, and with due respect to the earnest religious spirit of its gifted but unknown writer.

ception. It is that of men earlier than Judaism. It is that of the world's childhood. And it is a very child's picture of Him whom a grown man's reason and imagination cannot worthily set forth in thought or words. But, I say, the world's childhood thought correctly of the Divine character, inasmuch as it thought lovingly. God was truly known, whenever and wherever He was believed to be good and gracious. Not the mightiest giant in intellect can even yet imagine worthily of the Divine Being and Perfections, except as regards those perfections which make Him the object of trust and love. It is the *moral* character of God, then, rather than what we call his *natural* attributes, that the poet of Eden has worthily conceived of. His goodness, his fatherly care for his creatures, this poet has realized; though not his spirituality and invisible omnipresence. All that humanizing of the natural perfections of the Deity which is implied (rather than grossly expressed) in the description given of his intercourse with our first parents, far less revolts even the most spiritual idea the Christian can entertain, than the filial spirit of love and worship therein embodied towards the kindly parental providence so exercised over the inhabitants of Eden, approves itself to our feelings and our convictions too. The child's heart can feel love and gratitude for God's goodness, though his reason be lost in searching out God, or though his fancy may more likely invest Him with attributes too human. The grown man's mind, elevated to contemplation and trained to reasoning, can less worthily realize the greatness, the spirituality, the omnipresence of God, than the child's heart realizes his kindness. It is well if our manly love and trust have become stronger in proportion as they have become more enlightened. So, from our purer Christian notions of the spirituality, eternity and might of the all-present but still unknown God, we may come back to the days of Eden and ask ourselves, whether to our minds our Heavenly Father is as dear, and his character as attractive, as it was to the ruder conceptions of those older worshipers who believed Him to have "walked" with their progenitors "in the garden in the cool of the day."

The picture of Adam and Eve in the garden, both before their fall, and still more in the sad history of it, and in the sentence passed upon them after it,—a sentence not vindictive nor harsh, but reluctant, expostulating, tender, pronounced in fewest words, without one expression of reproach to add to the load of mortal sorrow or point the sting of conscious wrong-doing,—all shews that the writer of the history of Eden entertained a truly filial notion of the Almighty. His notion of the Divine *nature* is indeed humanized, anthropomorphic; but of the Divine *character* he has a true conception, for he conceives of it as benevolent. Only one trait occurs unworthy of a truly Paternal Deity, —and this comes from his perplexed theory of evil,—when he makes the Divine Being seem jealous of his human offspring: "Behold, the man is become as one of us." All the rest is humanized only as regards the natural attributes of Deity, while truly worthy of Heaven as regards those which belong to character.

It is curious and instructive to notice that Milton has shrunk from transferring into his modern page some of these humanized, or anthropomorphic, parts of the Scriptural representation. Thus, where the Scripture says, "They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the

garden," Milton introduces the vicegerent Son of God, instead of the Almighty himself, as going "to judge the transgressors:"

"Gentle airs, due at that hour
To fan the earth, now waked, and usher in
The evening cool; when He, from wrath more cool,
Came, the mild judge and intercessor both,
To sentence man. The voice of God they heard
Now walking in the garden, by soft winds
Brought to their ears while day declined; they heard,
And from His presence hid themselves among
The thickest trees, both man and wife."

Milton was himself an Arian in theological opinion. In his *Paradise Lost*, "the vicegerent Son" is the highest created being, the agent of the invisible God in the formation of the world, in the ways of his providence and in the work of redemption. This true poet justly felt, that to introduce the Divine Being personally as conversing in the garden with his offending creatures, would shock the more spiritual notion which Christians entertain respecting Him "whom no man hath seen nor can see." But, in doing this, he has varied (as he was quite authorized to do, for the high purposes of his great poem, and as he has done in a thousand other instances) from the text of Scripture. And, poetry apart, I believe those who hold the Arian, or even the Trinitarian creed, generally ascribe to the Son of God, in visible human form, and not to the Almighty Father, nor to the Holy Spirit, this act of conversing with our first parents in the garden. The Jewish writer shews no trace, however, of any such idea. He knew but of one God in one person; and that God is humanized by him to the conceptions of the days of Eden.

Now this mode of depicting the Divine Being and Character, is the illustrative fact so interesting to the student of Divine Revelation. He reads in it a voucher for the very high antiquity of the record, and even the essential truthfulness of the things recorded. These humanized conceptions of the Supreme Being are the venerable monument of the worship paid by the earliest race of men. While, on the other hand, the beautiful and affecting views of the character of God, as kind and paternal, which these very early records contain, require to be accounted for, and are fully explained on the supposition of primæval communications from the Almighty to the early race of men. Can the tone of this theology be explained on any other supposition? These ante-Mosaic documents imply the communication of various prior revelations to the patriarchs, and, earlier and earlier still, to the first human pair. Are such revelations credible, or are they not? is our question. An opinion on this subject can only be founded on *internal* evidence. And evidence of this kind arises out of the mode in which the character of God is depicted in the theology of the Garden of Eden and in that of the patriarchs.

The argument is briefly this: The Divine character, in these earliest of the world's records, is represented as more kind and truly paternal than it is in the Mosaic religion itself. To the Jews, from the time of Moses, God was great and powerful, in contradistinction to the idols of the nations. He was indeed merciful and gracious to them that obeyed him; but He was, above all, a jealous God, who would not give his glory to another. He was King, more than Father, to his peculiar

people. He was feared more than loved. His law of ordinances,—unknown in Eden, and only gradually growing up in the patriarchal times,—was matured by Moses, and became “a yoke grievous to be borne.” It was established upon penalties; it was vindicated by terrors. This sterner spirit of the ritual Judaism is one of its leading characteristics, marking its appropriateness to its own times and its own appointed uses, as designed to preserve the worship of one God amid the prevailing idolatry of the world, till the fulness of time should come when Christ should bring life and immortality to light.

How is it, then, we ask, that in these early records of patriarchal and præ-patriarchal times, prefixed to the history and laws of Moses, the Supreme Being is represented as more gentle and kind in character than he is in the Mosaic writings themselves? Had these prefixed records been a mere work of the imagination, a pure fiction of the days when the Mosaic religion was in operation, the theology ascribed to the patriarchs would naturally have been of the same caste as that which prevailed at the time when these pictures of earlier scenes were imagined or invented. That it is different from the Mosaic theology, and that it is truer in spirit while more childlike in form, is, I submit, a strong internal mark of the long antiquity of the Book of Genesis and the general credibility of its leading traditions; especially is it a reliable intimation that some such divine communications as are described in those early records (though we may not be certain as to their exact mode of announcement) were really vouchsafed by the kind Father of the human race to the early inhabitants of the earth. Amid all the critical difficulties which forbid us to receive these narratives as literally and exactly true, there is essential truth in the leading facts related respecting the Divine intercourse with the early race of men. The Almighty Father did, doubtless, at various times and in various ways, manifest his existence and character and presiding providence to his human offspring, probably from their first existence in this world. Admitting this, we can understand, what would else be inexplicable, how it came to pass that they worshiped Him as One and believed Him truly kind and paternal, and entertained more just and more affectionate thoughts as regards his character than prevailed in times long succeeding,—however childlike were their notions of his being or nature, through which the revealed idea of his character, in fact, found access to their simple hearts.

This kind of belief these earlier scriptural records fairly claim,—a reasoning, discriminating assent, together with the freest acknowledgment of difficulties wherever they exist, and the expression of opinion doubtfully where greater certainty is unattainable. Dogmatizing will make nothing certain that is in itself doubtful. But we may find, by legitimate reasoning and research, a richer vein of truth and devotion than those do who forbid us to stir the surface. “The letter killeth; the spirit maketh alive.” And the spirit of these venerable pages presents them still fresh and lively to our view, while the reasonable belief suggested by them,—that from the first days of human existence on this earth, the Almighty visited his creatures with intimations, more or less distinct, of his being, character and will,—is in harmony with our Christian conception of his paternal goodness.

E. H. H.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION AT EVESHAM.

BEFORE giving a sketch of the history of this religious society, it may not be without its use to premise a few facts illustrative of the general religious history of the town.

Evesham occupies a not undistinguished place in the ecclesiastical history of England. Its Benedictine Abbey, beautifully situated on a gentle slope rising above the western bank of the Avon, was endowed with lands which at the present day are said to produce an income of not less than £80,000. The agents employed in the suppression of monasteries, found the abbey of Evesham under the presidency of an earnest and generous man, the Abbot Lichfield, of whom a noble monument survives in the bell-tower of the monastery, on which the hand of time has fallen so gently, that it might be supposed a work of the 18th rather than of the 16th century. Notwithstanding the magnificence of the abbey and the power of its Benedictine monks, there were not wanting, as early as the beginning of the 15th century, indications in Evesham of a disposition to question the popular faith. John Badby, a tailor of Evesham, suffered martyrdom at Smithfield, in 1409, for denying the doctrine of the real presence and the power of the priests to effect a transubstantiation. He shrewdly argued, that if every host being consecrated at the altar were the Lord's body, then there would be twenty thousand Gods in England, whereas he declared his "belief in one God omnipotent." His martyrdom is notable from the accidental presence of Prince Henry (afterwards Henry V.), who, horrified by the sight of the flames applied in a burning tun or barrel to Badby, ordered the execution to be stopped, and entreated the martyr to recant, offering him not only a pardon, but a pension for life, if he would forsake his heresy and accept the faith of Holy Church. Badby firmly declined the royal mercy on these terms, and the Prince angrily ordered the execution to proceed. The proto-martyr in this persecution by Archbishop Arundel was William Sautre; Badby was the second. It is a strange circumstance that Fuller not only makes no mention of it in his "Church History," but incorrectly affirms, in his "Worthies of England," that the county of Worcester afforded no martyrs.

The Puritans were the successors, in the progress of the English Reformation, of the Lollards and the disciples of Wickliffe. Of the prevalence of Puritanism in Evesham there are several proofs. In 1600, Lewis Bailey, afterwards the Puritan Bishop of Bangor, was appointed Rector of All Saints; and it was during his residence in Evesham that he preached a series of sermons which were afterwards published, under the title of "The Practice of Piety, directing a Christian how to walk that he may please God." Of this work Anthony Wood said, that in his day it had passed through not less than forty editions, had been translated into the Welsh and French languages, and was by many persons regarded as of authority almost equal to that of the Scriptures.

In 1640, Edward Rudge, citizen and alderman of London, left a sum of money towards the maintenance of a lecturer in Evesham,— "to preach the word of God in the parish church every Sunday after-

noon, or upon some working day in every week, for ever;" and still further to indicate his bias towards Puritanism, he named as his first trustees, in whom the appointment of the lecturer was to rest, Dr. Gouge, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Burton and Mr. Culverwell, men of some eminence in Puritan and Nonconformist history. There were in 1662, on the passing of the Act of Uniformity, three churches in Evesham; that of St. Peter, Bengeworth, and those of All Saints and St. Lawrence. Of the incumbent of the first at that time not even the name is preserved. The incumbents of the two latter were Nonconformists.

Of George Hopkins, the Nonconformist Rector of All Saints, we have some account in Anthony Wood. He was the son of Mr. William Hopkins, who was elected a Member of the Long Parliament, for the town of Bewdley, but who did not live to take his seat. George Hopkins was born at Bewdley, April 15, 1620. He received his school education partly in his native town and partly at Kinfare. In the year 1637, he became a batler of New Inn, one of the Halls of Oxford, which had as Principal, Christopher Rogerson, described by Wood as "a Puritan and a precise scholar;" and by Calamy, as "a plain man and a lover of good people." Mr. Hopkins graduated B. A. 1641. In the month of April, in the year 1642, his connection with All Saints church in Evesham begun. This appears from the register, although it is contrary to the statement of Anthony Wood, who represents him as coming to Evesham early after 1648, when he returned to Oxford, submitted to the Visitors appointed by Parliament, took the covenant and graduated M. A. In 1654, he received an appointment as one of the Commissioners for ejecting scandalous ministers and schoolmasters in Worcestershire. Shortly after this he preached, at a weekly lecture at Evesham, seven sermons against the Antinomian heresy. These were published in 1655, under the title of *Salvation from Sin by Jesus Christ*, &c., and dedicated to the inhabitants of Evesham, to whom he declared he had from the first devoted himself. The Act of Uniformity drove him from his living. He found shelter at Dumbleton, in the neighbouring county of Gloucester, where he spent the short remainder of his life, and where he died, at the age of forty-six, March 25, 1666. He was buried in the chancel of the church at Dumbleton, in which he had been accustomed to worship after he himself had been silenced. Wood gives him the praise of being skilled in the mathematics as well as divinity, and of being an example, "such as is rarely found among the Nonconformists, of great candour and moderation." He left a family behind him, one of whom, William Hopkins, conformed, studied at Trinity Hall, Oxford, and became a Prebendary of Worcester. Another son appears to have entered into trade, and was a mercer in Evesham. Early in the following century, the name of William Hopkins is found in the trust-deed of the Presbyterian chapel. He was a vintner, and removed to Alcester.

The ejected minister of St. Lawrence, Evesham, was Thomas Matthew; but beyond his name, little or nothing is known of him.

There is no tradition of religious services in Evesham being stealthily celebrated during the darker days of the persecutions of Charles II. and James II. The early death of Mr. Hopkins and the probable withdrawal of Mr. Matthew, were discouraging and adverse circumstances. That there was, however, from the first, a Nonconformist and Presby-

terian congregation, which kept together in spite of difficulties and disappointments, is rendered highly probable by subsequent events. The spirit of Nonconformity certainly prevailed in the town during the last years of the 17th century. The followers of George Fox, and the Baptists, had gathered their congregations here, and so, there can be no reason for doubting, had the Presbyterians. The first place of worship was probably only of a temporary kind, a barn or some large room. It was situated at the back of High Street, and within the angle formed by the western side of High Street and the northern side of Magpie Lane. The first minister whose name has been preserved was Rev. John Higgs. He was probably the son of Rev. Daniel Higgs, a Worcestershire man, who was ejected from a living in South Wales, afterwards ministered to a congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Swansea, and finally died in his native county, September 1691. Calamy states that Daniel Higgs "undertook to teach academical learning, in which he took great delight and had good success." John Higgs was probably his pupil. When he settled at Evesham is unknown: he was there in 1714, and had probably resided there some years, as he then buried, in All Saints church, his first wife, Mary, aged 44, and had previously buried several of her children who died in infancy. He married again a lady of suitable age to his own, and both died at Evesham—he in September, she in October, 1728. From the epitaphs in All Saints church, these particulars—all that can be certainly known of him—are derived.*

The successor of Mr. Higgs was Rev. Francis Blackmore, son of Rev. Chewning Blackmore, of Worcester. In a letter dated October 10, 1728, from the latter to the former, then supplying temporarily the pulpit at Gloucester, these words occur: "Evesham much press you coming to them the first sabbath you are free." A memoir of Mr. Blackmore will be shortly given, introductory to the next chapter of the Blackmore Papers. For the present, it will be sufficient to state that he had received his academical education first at Findern, under Dr. Latham, and afterwards at the University of Glasgow; that his connection with the congregation at Evesham was happy though brief, and that it terminated, in 1730, by his removal to Coventry as successor to Rev. John Partington, and as assistant or colleague to Rev. John Warren. The choice by the Evesham congregation of Mr. Blackmore is a proof of their decided leaning, at this early period, to liberal sentiments. From the first, Dr. Latham's pupils were distinguished by a spirit of fearless inquiry, and by their indifference to the reputation for "orthodoxy." We shall presently see that the early termination of his engagement at Evesham did not interrupt the kindly feelings of the people towards Mr. Blackmore. How the pulpit was supplied during the two or three years subsequent to Mr. Blackmore's retirement, is not known.

The next minister is one who deserves a longer record, and whose worth, talents and learning, have hitherto scarcely received the attention and respect to which they are entitled.

* There was a Benjamin Higgs (or Higgses) settled as a Dissenting minister at Farrington. He was a pupil, either at Gloucester or Stratford-upon-Avon, of Rev. John Alexander, who removed in 1729 to Dublin.

Paul Cardale was born in the year 1705, probably at Dudley.* At the proper age, he proceeded to the academy recently undertaken by Dr. Ebenezer Latham. Here he formed friendships, which terminated only with life, with the two sons of Mr. Chewning Blackmore and others, and here he laid a solid foundation of theological learning, and formed those habits of free inquiry and unreserved publication of opinion which distinguished him in after life. Immediately on leaving the academy, he formed an engagement as assistant minister at Kidderminster. The earliest date marked on the MS. sermons preached at this place is May 29, 1726, when he was only twenty-one years of age. Dr. Caleb Fleming speaks of his "earlier ministerial labours at Kidderminster being of the more contracted Calvinistical complexion," and adds, that this circumstance in the retrospect was truly humiliating to him. It may perhaps be thought that Dr. Fleming unconsciously exaggerated the Calvinistic character of Mr. Cardale's early teaching. He speaks also of his "educational principles" as partaking of the same influence. It is tolerably certain that the leaven of the instructions at Findern was not very Calvinistic. As Dr. Fleming had neither studied at Findern, nor commenced his acquaintance with Mr. Cardale until after the year 1735, his statement respecting the early portions of his friend's life may properly enough be tested by the rules of evidence. Dr. Fleming is incorrect in the date he gives to Mr. Cardale's settlement at Evesham—"about 1735." He was invited by the congregation in 1733, and probably became at once their minister. The congregation must have increased in both zeal and numbers, for within five years of his settlement measures were taken for obtaining a site for a new chapel. The conveyance of the land in Oat Street was made to Mr. Cardale and others in behalf of "the Protestant Dissenters commonly called Presbyterians." The mayor and recorder of the borough granted a licence for the intended place, October 11, 1737. In the chapel-deed, which bears date October 3, 1737, amongst other trustees named, are Gerard Suffield, of London, gentleman, and Thomas Suffield, of Evesham, maltster. The exact date of the opening of the new chapel does not appear: it might be in 1738 or 1739. If it were in the course of erection in 1737, as may be inferred from the licence, a building of such moderate proportions, and so simple in its architecture, would not require two or three years for its completion. The opening service was performed by their former pastor, Mr. Francis Blackmore, assisted probably by others, "with great acceptance and solemnity." What doctrine was preached in the new chapel by Mr.

* Mr. May, in his History of Evesham, states that Mr. Cardale was a native of Derbyshire. He gives no authority for the statement, and probably confounded the place of his education with that of his birth. In the early records of the Dudley congregation, the name of Cardale is found. Samuel Cardale was one of the trustees appointed in 1701 for purchasing land and erecting a chapel. A William Cardale was also a subscriber to the chapel fund. Both are spoken of as related to Mr. Paul Cardale. Amongst the papers of the latter were found some documents connected with the prosecution of the High-church rioters who destroyed the chapel at Dudley in 1715. His portrait has remained until very lately at Dudley, in the possession of some ladies of the name of Hughes. It is not improbable that Paul was the son of Samuel Cardale, the original trustee of the Dudley chapel. It is to be regretted that the register of baptisms at the chapel begins only in 1743.

Cardale himself, we have the means of exactly ascertaining. The first seven sermons were from Exodus xx. 24, on the recording of God's name in places of public worship; in which the preacher discusses with much force the supposed consecration and holiness of places of worship, and vindicates the free and public exercise of religion on the principles of Nature and Christianity,—the whole series of discourses aiming to recommend Christian worship in its purity and simplicity. With such favour were these discourses received by the people who heard them, and by the neighbouring ministers who had the opportunity of reading them in the author's manuscripts, that he was induced to commit them to the press. They appeared in an octavo volume, in 1740, under the title of "The Gospel Sanctuary;" and in respect to accuracy in the explanation of Scripture, liberality of sentiment, force of style, and appropriateness of illustration, may be safely put in comparison with any specimens of English pulpit eloquence produced during the first half of the 18th century. Not the slightest trace appears of Calvinism or "orthodoxy" of any kind. The author shews a just appreciation of the nature and grounds of Christian liberty, and a determination to resist bigotry and superstition in all their forms. Two very short extracts will suffice to shew the spirit of the whole work:

"The love of truth is the likeliest way to be led into it; the best preparative for receiving and understanding it. If persons of this temper should *mistake* the truth in lesser points, God will accept them. Even the errors which they fall into will be less offensive to God, than the truest motives in the world by *chance*, where rational enquiry is suppressed or neglected. A man must *believe, think and judge* as he *can*, not as he *will*; and where he honestly seeks the truth or endeavours to find it, his *involuntary mistakes* will be *innocent errors*, and every whit as pleasing to God, as *accidental orthodoxy*."—P. 174.

"Bigotry to a church, and an unpeaceable, factious spirit in it, are the two things that make and constitute *schism*. We should not only love those of our own communion, but all honest and good men of every persuasion. For persons to *confine* their charity, argues too much their *want* of charity; and bigotry after all is the most dangerous schism; the guilt whereof a man is not necessarily involved in, or secured from, by being of *this*, or *that*, or *any* party of Christians. It was an excellent saying of a learned and grave divine (Mr. Philip Henry), 'I am too much a Catholic to be a Roman Catholic,' i. e. he was too much a Christian to confine his charity to a party, or limit salvation to his own communion."—Pp. 190, 191.

Mr. Cardale married a member of his congregation, Sarah, the sister of Mr. Thomas Suffield, whose name has been already mentioned as an original trustee of the chapel. The lady was three years older than her husband, and it may be supposed, from its being recorded on his monumental slab that he had married the sister of Mr. Thomas Suffield, that the connection (in the opinion at least of the lady's family) added to the social rank as well as the happiness of Mr. Cardale. She died about eight years before her husband, aged 65.

The circumstances of Mr. Cardale on his settlement at Evesham did not greatly favour the attainment of profound theological knowledge. The situation was isolated; the roads to Worcester and other towns in the county where Dissenting congregations were established were, except in summer time, far from good; theological libraries were inaccessible, and books of any kind scarce. Over all these difficulties

Mr. Cardale triumphed, and by long and patient study became one of the ablest Scripture critics of his age. The theological characteristics of the times were various. The bold Socinianism of the writers of the 17th century had been succeeded by the cautious Arianism of Emlyn, Peirce and Hallet. There was, both in and out of the Church, a tendency towards free theological speculation; but by some of the Protestant Dissenters it was resisted with a fierce and passionate bigotry. Early in the century, Emlyn had suffered imprisonment and fine for heresy, and twenty years afterwards Peirce found only in a premature grave rest from the virulence of "orthodox" denunciations. Lardner was just beginning to publish the fruits of his laborious investigations. Other men who were the theological lights of the latter half of the century had not risen on the horizon; Theophilus Lindsey was a school-boy, and Priestley an infant. Whatever sympathy Mr. Cardale might obtain from one or two of the more cultivated members of his congregation, it was scarcely to be expected that the shop-keepers and market-gardeners, who formed the staple of his flock, would always appreciate the results of their pastor's indefatigable studies. Much less costly and laborious discourses than his would have better pleased his people, especially if their effect had been strengthened by frequent social and gossiping visits, for which the retired biblical scholar had neither time nor taste. However novel the opinions were to which his studies led him, he shewed no rash haste in proclaiming them to the world through the press. After the publication of the "Gospel Sanctuary," he allowed eighteen years to elapse before he re-appeared as an author. He then published "A new Office of Devotion," to which he added the "Prayer of a true Catholic or of a consistent Protestant." To the composition of his devotional exercises this good man throughout life paid particular attention, and the warm and evangelical tone of his prayers shews how possible it is to combine a pure devotional taste with the practice of theological controversy.

The neighbouring ministers, with whom Mr. Cardale maintained the intimate relations of friendship, were Mr. George Broadhurst, of Alcester, whose ingenuity of mind and cheerful temper gave a charm to his conversation and vivacity to his letters, and his two fellow-students at Findern, Francis and Edward Blackmore, who both spent their closing years at Worcester. At a distance from Worcestershire, his principal friend was Dr. Caleb Fleming, with whom for forty years he maintained a constant friendship, and who in a brief memoir of his friend declared that "no two persons more harmonized in theological opinions and the interpretation of the principal doctrines of the gospel." When Mr. Cardale became an author, he found in Dr. Fleming a careful and competent editor to revise his works and to carry them successfully through the press. Mr. Cardale's talents and learning procured him, however, little fame during his life. Even as late as 1771, we find Mr. Lindsey inquiring about him from Dr. Priestley, with whom, as the Editor of the Theological Repository, Mr. Cardale occasionally corresponded. Dr. Priestley's knowledge of him does not appear to have led to personal intercourse, for he writes to Mr. Lindsey of him in these terms: "He is by all accounts a most excellent man, one after your own heart." In the correspondence of Priestley with Dr. Toulmin, many years after,

allusion is made to an intended memoir of Mr. Cardale. "I am glad" (wrote Dr. Priestley, in 1789) "that you are rescuing from oblivion the memory of so valuable a man." If the memoir were ever printed, it has not fallen under the notice of the writer. At Evesham itself Mr. Cardale found few lettered associates. In the neighbourhood he had one valued and accomplished friend, a clergyman, Rev. John Rawlins, M.A., rector of Leigh, in Worcestershire, and minister of Badsey and Wickamford.* Besides several sermons preached on public occasions at the Cathedral of Worcester and before the University of Oxford, Mr. Rawlins was the author of "A Dissertation upon Heretical Opinions, shewing the Nature of Heresy, in what respects Errors in Religion may be Innocent or Sinful," &c. The spirit of this work, which was published in 1772, may be gathered from the author's motto:

In necessariis unitas;
In non necessariis libertas;
In omnibus caritas.

The merit due to Mr. Rawlins on account of his liberality of sentiment, and his warm friendship towards the Unitarian pastor of Evesham, is heightened by the fact of his own "orthodoxy," which is attested by a sermon published in 1776, entitled, "Divine Worship due to the whole blessed Trinity, the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, as being one and the same God, proved from Scripture and Antiquity, as that Doctrine is taught in the Articles, and the Practice of it enjoined in the Liturgy of the Church of England."

In 1761, Mr. Cardale's limited circle of literary and theological friends sustained a severe loss by the death of Rev. Francis Blackmore. At the request of the widow and other members of the family of his deceased friend, the funeral sermon was preached at Evesham by Mr. Cardale. It was afterwards printed, and bears the title of "The distinctive Character and Honour of the Righteous Man considered." Speaking from a full and honest heart, Mr. Cardale, while portraying his friend, has in many passages described himself. We cannot doubt that when he penned the following passage, he had a passing thought of his own isolated and neglected position:

"The most excellent and worthy character may be sometimes concealed under the veil of a humble and virtuous modesty. The virtues of some would make a distinguishing figure, and create admiration, if they were brought out of obscurity. And this may be the case, no doubt, with many righteous and good men, who may be now held in little or no estimation. Those who are about them may not discern their excellencies, or they may fail in that respect which is due to real merit."—P. 55.

In 1767, Mr. Cardale put forth the volume on which his reputation as a theologian will mainly rest. Its title was, "The True Doctrine of the New Testament concerning Jesus Christ considered; wherein the Misrepresentations that have been made of it upon the Arian Hypothesis and upon all Trinitarian and Athanasian Principles are exposed, and the Honour of our Saviour's Divine Character and Mission is maintained." Prefixed to this work was a "Discourse upon the Right

* "Rawlins (John), Ch. Ch., M. A., Nov. 27, 1730."—*Catalogue of Oxford Graduates.*

of Private Judgment in Matters of Religion," of which, in its improved form in a second edition, Dr. Fleming observed, that it "exhausted the argument which condemns the operations either of civil or of ecclesiastical power in the province of religion." The work itself is an elaborate argument, first and chiefly against the Arian, and next against the Athanasian representations of Christ. After explaining John viii. 18 of Christ's official character as the Messiah, he proceeds to argue against the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ as inconsistent with his humanity and his temptations, as injurious to the influence of his example, and as inexplicable in connection with his painful sufferings, his faith and patience in their endurance, and his being raised to a state of glory in reward of his constancy. He further argues that the pre-existence of Christ is inconsistent with his office of Mediator and Intercessor. The popular theory of the proper Deity of Christ is discussed more summarily, because, apart from the texts quoted by Arian advocates, it has little or no scriptural authority. In an Appendix on the Logos, he argues strongly against the identification of it with the *person* of Christ.

"The True Doctrine of the New Testament" was the most successful, as it was the most elaborate, of our author's works. It reached, in 1771, a second edition, which was corrected and enlarged. In conjunction with Dr. Lardner's celebrated "Letter on the Logos," it made a great revolution in the opinions of learned men. This is attested by Dr. Kippis in a note to his Life of Dr. Lardner. Dr. Caleb Fleming states that the views which Mr. Cardale was led to adopt and publish, proved satisfactory and delightful to him. They produced an enlargedness of mind and increased benevolence of heart. He adds, too, that these "his later labours were not lost: so far from wanting a proof of their efficacy, he had received from several of the Established clergy of distinguished character testimonials of his writings having met with their approbation, and that his views of the New-Testament doctrine of Jesus Christ had thrown conviction before them and removed their prejudices." Facts like this are humiliating proofs of the mischief wrought by an Established religion which extorts a doctrinal confession. How degraded the moral position of these dignified clergymen, who thus thought with the wise and spoke with the vulgar! Their praise of this Unitarian confessor of Evesham was in fact their own heavy censure.

There is in the possession of Rev. Timothy Davis,—the living successor of Mr. Paul Cardale both in his pulpit and his enlightened zeal for Christian truth,—a copy of the second edition of "The True Doctrine of the New Testament," which belonged to the author, which contains various emendations of and additions to the text. On the fly-leaf Mr. C. wrote—"The pages in which some improvements *might* be made, in another edition, are the following; viz., pp. 18, 20, 38, 39, 49, 50," &c. At p. 18, there is this insertion: "Toleration is a pretty anodyne that may ease our distempers for a time, but will never make a perfect cure." After the note at the foot of p. 20, there is this addition: "I can never transfer to another the right of judging for me. In matters of faith and religion, no man can have a substitute or a representative." At p. 50, there is this addition to the *note*: "We should always interpret the more difficult passages of Scripture by those that

are clear and evident, remembering that what is necessary to all men, be level to the capacities of all."

In 1772, Mr. Cardale published, but without his name, "A Comment upon some Remarkable Passages in Christ's Prayer at the Close of his Public Ministry." This is in fact an extension of his Scripture argument for the proper humanity of Christ, and against the Arian hypothesis of his pre-existence. The argument is well conducted, with modesty and reverence for the personal virtues and official glory of the Saviour. It concludes with a sentiment which appears to have been a favourite thought of Mr. Cardale, for it often re-appears in his works:—"As sincerity and charity will always stand in the highest account with God, and are the surest marks of true Christian orthodoxy, so I am verily persuaded, with an ancient writer (Aug. de Mendaciâ), that if the love of truth makes men err, such error cannot be dangerous;—*Nunquam errari tutius existimo, quam cum in nimio amore veritatis erratur.*"

In 1774, Mr. Cardale published, also without his name, "A Treatise on the Application of certain Terms and Epithets to Jesus Christ, shewing that they have no Foundation either in the written Revelation or in any Principles of sound Reason and true Philosophy." This work is characterized, equally with the others, by the author's earnest zeal to vindicate the sole Deity of the Father of Jesus Christ. A passage in which he declaims against the pretensions of Christian priests to bind and loose, rises to an unwonted degree of animation.

"It is no less than invading the rights of Deity, and near akin to the supposed blasphemy of which the Jews accused our blessed Saviour. And so far as this Popish leaven diffuses itself in any church or community, the consequences of it must be very hurtful and mischievous. It has a natural tendency, especially amongst weak and vulgar minds, to lull the conscience into a state of security; to buoy up the sinner with a presumptuous hope and confidence of obtaining mercy and forgiveness when there is no foundation for it; and thereby encourage him to trust in the favour and mercy of God, even whilst destitute of moral rectitude and purity of heart. It is a *luscious* doctrine, as one very aptly calls it. For thus may any, even the greatest sinner, reason with himself when *applying* for absolution—'Surely, what the Priest, who is God's ambassador, says, may be depended upon as the word of God.' Thus is conscience hushed, appeased and quieted from all painful apprehensions by an imaginary supposed pardon of all past offences. In a word, all high-flown episcopal claims of power and authority in the present case are weak and groundless. They have at least a delusive appearance and dangerous tendency. They can only be calculated to advance the power of the priest, and to stupify and enslave the consciences of men; and a spirit of just indignation should, and surely must, arise against this and all other encroachments upon the rights of conscience and Christian liberty. How long shall this enormous power subsist, this noxious plant of Popery be suffered to grow, in a Protestant country? This is certainly a plant which our Heavenly Father never planted, which Christ and his apostles never cultivated; and for any professed ministers of the gospel *now* to favour or plead for its continuance and growth in the church, which is God's vineyard, must be so far from heightening, that it has a manifest and direct tendency to sink the sacerdotal character into the deepest scorn and contempt."—Pp. 38, 39.

The only other publications of Mr. Cardale issued during his life were two papers contributed to the Theological Repository, under the signature previously affixed to "The True Doctrine of the N. T.,"

Phileleutherus Vigorniensis. The first is entitled "The Christian Creed" (Vol. I. pp. 136—140); the second, a Critical Inquiry into the Meaning of that Phrase, *the Form of God*, when applied to Jesus Christ, Philipp. ii. 6 (Vol. II. pp. 141—154, and 219—230). The latter essay was designed as a supplement to his "True Doctrine," &c.

Mr. Cardale's publications chiefly bear date subsequent to the death of his wife. We may suppose that he sought in intense theological study a refuge from the sadness of a solitary old age. His sedentary habits (censured by Mr. Job Orton as leading to the neglect of pastoral visits) injured his constitution, and his later years were troubled by a painful debility of limbs and voice. His friend at Alcester, Mr. Broadhurst, was about the same time debilitated by a stroke of paralysis. Dr. Fleming continued to the last his occasional visits to Evesham, and the deep and undiminished interest taken by these two venerable scholars to the latest period of their lives in the assertion and maintenance of Unitarianism, is an instructive spectacle, and should serve as a rebuke to the fickleness of some modern Unitarians, who turn away with indifference from the simple doctrines of the gospel in search of more stimulating novelties.

During the last six months of his life, Mr. Cardale was permitted to enjoy the undiminished exercise of his mental faculties, and found interesting occupation in the composition of an "Inquiry whether we have any Scripture Warrant for a direct Address of Supplication, Praise or Thanksgiving, either to the Son or to the Holy Ghost." He declared to Dr. Fleming, on a visit which that gentleman paid him in the summer of 1774, that he was strongly impressed with the importance of the subject, and that he regarded his essay upon it as a proper conclusion to his argument against the Athanasian heresy, which he looked on as so detrimental and disgraceful to Christianity. On the evening of the last day of February, 1775, he put the last stroke to this work, and retired to rest. Without the slightest pain and without any struggle, his soul parted from the feeble tenement in which it was lodged. So gentle was his dismissal, that his attendant did not at once observe the change, but thought that he had only dropped into a short sleep.

By his will he constituted Dr. Fleming his literary executor, leaving to him his MSS. in long-hand, consisting chiefly of devotional compositions. Dr. Fleming immediately published the "Inquiry," to which he prefixed a somewhat meagre account of the author, and appended a letter on the Personality of the Spirit, addressed to him, in 1774, by Dr. Lardner. The devotional compositions Dr. Fleming did not publish, but returned them to the executors of Mr. Cardale, one of whom was Rev. James Kettle, of Warwick. Some years after, a small duodecimo volume of Prayers was published, but it has never fallen under the notice of the writer, nor can the name of the editor be stated. By his will Mr. Cardale bequeathed to the trustees of the chapel in Oat or Ode Street the sum of £200. With this and other money in their hands the trustees purchased freehold lands at Woodmancote, in the parish of Bishops' Cleeve, for an endowment. His remains were deposited near those of his wife; and in the north aisle of All Saints church a monumental slab is seen, on which his friend, Rev. John Rawlins, inscribed this epitaph:

He was happily adorned with integrity of mind and simplicity of manners.
 In his whole character he was truly amiable;
 As a man, peaceable and inoffensive;
 As a Christian, pious and sincere;
 As a minister of the gospel, learned and indefatigable;
 That Christian virtue, Charity, was the crown of all;
 It breathed in his sentiments,
 And gave a lustre of grace and goodness to all his actions.
 By this divine rule he constantly walked,
 And as he lived,
 So he died, in the Lord.

Mr. Cardale had the advantage of a fine person, but did not possess as a preacher good elocution or animation of manner. Job Orton, in a depreciatory notice of him in a letter to Rev. John Hughes, states that he had by his learned, critical and dry discourses ruined a fine congregation, and had at the last about twenty people to hear him. The statement is in every respect an exaggeration. The congregation could, from the size of the chapel, never have been large, and there are reasons for believing it was not reduced to the low state ascribed to it. Mr. Orton gives Mr. Cardale the praise of "good sense" and "good temper." The candid reader of the "Gospel Sanctuary" and the "True Doctrine" will think this very feeble praise of works which are not surpassed in literary merit by the best of Mr. Orton's works, and which only require to be known to take a very high place in the Non-conformist literature of the 18th century. We will close this attempt to do justice to one whose reputation hitherto has been far less than his merits, by observing, that if a clear intellect and an upright heart, an exemplary and unblemished life, and ardent zeal for Christian truth, directed by knowledge, and actively devoted for nearly half a century to the removal of the corruptions of Christianity, are a valid title to respect and honour, the name of PAUL CARDALE deserves to be ranked with those of BIDDLE, EMLYN, PRIESTLEY and LINDSEY.

Of the successors of Mr. Cardale in the Evesham pulpit, the notices must be very brief. His immediate successor was Rev. David Jones, a native of Cardigan. He studied at the academy of Carmarthen, where he was a fellow-student of Rev. David Davis, of Castle Howell. He did not remain long in Evesham, but removed in 1783 to Prescott, in Lancashire, where he died in 1798, and was interred on the last day of that year in the Presbyterian burial-ground, his funeral sermon being preached by Rev. Peter Houghton, of Chowbent, who became his successor at Prescott.

The next minister was Rev. Henry Procter. He was son of a minister of the same name—was born 1733, and entered the academy at Daventry in 1752, under Dr. Ashworth, and had, previously to his removal to Evesham, settled at Whitney, Stamford and Whitechurch. His ministerial duties at Evesham continued about five years, but were not attended with success. Disputes arose between him and his flock, the numbers of which were diminished by the establishment of a society of Huntingdonian Methodists. A separation took place in 1788; but for some time Mr. Procter continued to reside in the town, holding, however, no intercourse with the congregation. He was described by his successor as "a man of very decent manners, with too much of the courtliness, to use no other word, of the ministers of the last age. He

had some knowledge and a great deal of anecdote, and he had a considerable library of useful books." He afterwards removed to Stafford, taking charge of the small Presbyterian societies there and in the neighbouring town of Stone. After nineteen years' ministration to declining congregations, he died at Stone, and Presbyterian worship ceased in both towns.

His successor was a man of considerable talents and attainments, which, if combined with an amiable temper, would have secured for him usefulness, respect and happiness. As it was, his life was a perpetual struggle with jealousies and self-created difficulties and enmities. Dr. Charles Lloyd was the third son of Rev. D. Lloyd, of Llwynrhydowen, the first Antitrinitarian minister in the Principality—an able and popular preacher. Charles Lloyd was born in 1766, and received his school education from Rev. D. Davis (father of the Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham), whom in after life he described as "a learned, skilful, but severe schoolmaster, who taught the dead languages with sound taste, with uncommon accuracy except in one respect" (probably the reference is to prosody), "and with particular success." About 1783, he entered the academy at Swansea, where, amongst others, he had Lewis Lloyd, the distinguished banker and the father of Lord Overstone, as a fellow-student. In August, 1788, being then in his twenty-second year, he was introduced by the friendly mediation of Rev. Nathaniel Philipps, of Derby, to the Evesham congregation, by whom he was immediately elected pastor.

Here it may be necessary to state, that about a quarter of a century after the formation of this engagement, Dr. Charles Lloyd composed and published anonymously a partial Autobiography, under the title of "Particulars of the Life of a Dissenting Minister, written by Himself. With occasional Reflections, illustrative of the Education and Professional State of the Dissenting Clergy, and of the Character and Manners of the Dissenters in general." There are many inaccuracies in this book,—some the result of lapse of time and impaired memory, others probably occasioned by sickness of heart and a temper soured by disappointment. The book has been suppressed, and is now exceedingly rare. The picture presented of the Evesham congregation at the time when the author joined it abounds chiefly in shade, and is sufficiently gloomy. He represents the attendance as reduced to forty: of them only one was an avowed "*Socinian*." This is remarkable, considering that only thirteen years had elapsed since the death of Mr. Cardale. The occupations of the people he describes as not very respectable, but their wealth considerable. They were very indifferent, and offered to their pastor only £40 a year. Their knowledge was very small, and their dispositions unquestionably bad and bitter. The Socinian member of the congregation was "a Diotrephes, and loved the pre-eminence." For a time he was not allowed to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper, because he had not received ordination. The cost of an ordination service, however, reconciled the people at length to his officiating without ordination. The only lights he throws into the picture are the aptitude of the young to receive instruction, and his pleasant and improving intercourse with four female members of the society who had cultivated minds, rational views of religion, and zeal for its genuine success. It was scarcely to be ex-

pected that success could long attend the ministrations offered to a people so little loved or respected by their pastor. It only required a slight occasion for discord to enter and the connection to be dissolved. That occasion arose out of a change of sentiments respecting infant baptism. In a letter to his flock, dated April 3, 1790, Dr. Lloyd offered to remain with them if they would more zealously co-operate with his plans, be more regular in their attendance, and dispense with the baptism of their children by him. The congregation thought proper to accept his resignation. By means of Dr. Toulmin, he was introduced to a Baptist congregation at Ditchling, with whom he settled. He afterwards removed to Palgrave, in Suffolk, and was for a short time connected with other religious societies. He received, in 1809, a diploma (LL.D.) from the University of Glasgow. Ultimately abandoning the ministry, he devoted himself to tuition and literature. For many years he kept a school in Keppel Street, Russell Square. His publications were—*Two Sermons on Christian Zeal and the Progress of the Gospel*; 1808. *Observations on the Choice of a School*; 1812. *Particulars of the Life of a Dissenting Minister*; 1813. *Travels at Home, &c.*, 5 vols., and the *Monthly Repository Extraordinary*; 1819. The not happy life of this able but singular man was brought to a close, after an illness of very brief duration, whilst he was visiting some relatives at Lampeter, in May, 1829.

The next minister at Evesham was Rev. Benjamin Kingsbury. He was born at Warwick about 1765,—had been educated at Daventry under Rev. Thomas Belsham, entering that academy, 1783, in company with Mr. Kell, Mr. Allard, Mr. Butcher and Mr. John Holland. On quitting the academy he settled at Warwick. A very singular difference of taste, rather than opinion, occasioned his abrupt dismissal. The question in dispute was the propriety of returning in a public assembly special thanks to the Almighty for preservation in child-birth. The minister's taste revolted from this practice, and his refusal to comply with it, or to render his reasons for his refusal, led to a separation. One would deem it impossible that an important relation like the pastoral office should be dissolved on account of a trifling difference of opinion of this kind, if one had not heard of a not dissimilar result from a difference of opinion respecting the propriety of standing or sitting during the singing of hymns.—Mr. Kingsbury, in 1791, contracted, under somewhat romantic circumstances, a marriage with the daughter of an eminent hardwareman in London, and left the ministry to succeed his father-in-law in business. He was an author, publishing when he was in the ministry, "*An Answer to an Address to the People of Great Britain, by the Bishop of Llandaff, in another Address to the People*," 1788; "*Prayers for the Use of Families*," 1790; and after he had quitted the ministry, "*A Recommendation of Family Religion*," 1792; "*An Address to the People of Great Britain on the proposed Tax upon Income*," 1798. But the most popular of Mr. Kingsbury's productions was "*A Treatise on Razors, in which the Weight, Shape and Temper of a Razor are considered*," 1797.

Mr. Kingsbury was succeeded at Evesham by Rev. Benjamin Davis (uncle to the present minister). He was born at Goytre, near Lampeter, Oct. 23, 1756. He was a pupil in the schools of Rev. Joshua

Thomas, of Leominster, Mr. Esquire, at Hereford, and his brother, Mr. David Davis, of Castle Howell, already mentioned. In 1775, he entered the academy at Daventry, where he enjoyed the instructions first of Mr. Robins and then of Mr. Belsham. His proficiency in his studies was such as to lead to his appointment as classical and mathematical tutor at Carmarthen. He continued in this post till the academy was removed to Swansea. Afterwards, he undertook the office of tutor in the family of Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool; thence he removed to Walsall, to be pastor of the Presbyterian congregation of that place. At Evesham, to which he next removed, he sustained the pastoral office for nearly twenty years, to the entire satisfaction of a united flock. During his illness the members of his congregation vied with one another in affectionate attentions to him, which made a deep impression on his mind. His chief anxiety was for the welfare of his people, and he was very desirous that they should find in his successor a warm attachment to the distinctive principles of Unitarianism. He died Jan. 1, 1811, and is interred in All Saints churchyard. His funeral sermon was preached by Dr. Toulmin; and the reader desirous of further information concerning this worthy man may consult the *Mon. Repos.* VI. 251—253.

The next minister was Rev. Peter Charles, also a native of the Principality, who after a short period quitted the pulpit, but continued to reside in the town, and gained a humble subsistence as librarian to the public circulating library. To him succeeded Rev. Thomas Davis (brother of the present minister). Ill health drove him into retirement very shortly after the commencement of his duties at Evesham. The memory of his virtues is still cherished by his relatives with warm affection. For nearly two years after this the pulpit was supplied by Mr. William Williams, a Carmarthen student, of whom an interesting obituary notice from the pen of Dr. T. Rees will be found in the *Mon. Repos.* XIV. 510—514.

Another minister from the Principality succeeded to the pulpit at Evesham in the person of Rev. John Evans. When he entered the academy at Carmarthen, his sentiments were orthodox, but the conclusion of his theological course found him settled in Unitarian principles. His first ministerial engagement was at Ilminster; thence he came to Evesham; but, after a short stay, removed in 1819 to Carmarthen, to undertake the charge of the Unitarian congregation in that town. He died there, June 24, 1825, aged forty-three years.

After this rapid and painful succession of changes, the Evesham congregation had the good fortune to engage the services of the now venerable man who is fulfilling the four-and-thirtieth year of his ministry amongst them. Rev. Timothy Davis removed to Evesham from Coventry, June 21, 1819. The first years of his ministry were devoted to his native country, being co-pastor with his father. Throughout his long life he has kept up the habit of occasional preaching in Welsh, and amongst his published discourses several are in this language.

During the present century, some valuable additions have been made to the trust property of the chapel. In 1811, Mr. John New gave a leasehold messuage in Ode Street, which has since been converted into two cottages. Mr. Anthony New also gave a freehold

message in High Street, similarly converted into cottages. In 1820, a gallery was added, and the interior of the chapel was renewed with simple taste by the munificence of Mr. Anthony New. In 1829, the same gentleman presented to the congregation a sweet-toned organ. The neatly-kept burial-ground is also a modern addition; but already the grassy mounds and the well-cut tombstones tell of many a worshiper, who once came to this house of prayer, now resting in the mute unconsciousness of the grave. The eyes of survivors, as they walk to the house of God, fall on these simple memorials of departed worth. The sight

“opens all the cells
Where Memory slept,”

and the hymn of praise and the prayer of faith ascend from hearts softened by sorrow and exalted by Christian hope.

The congregation at Evesham is not large, but its members are intelligent, zealous and united. It is increasing rather than diminishing in numbers, and is looked upon with respect and kindness by other religious bodies in the town.

LINES ON HEBER.

O'ER Kedron's vale, by Jordan's stream,
The harp of David sweetly thrilled,
And with the morning's opening beam
The sacred plains with gladness filled.

By Lebanon at dewy eve
Still softly flowed that voice of praise,
The cedars trembling to receive
The radiance of the sun's last rays.

Such, Heber! was thy youthful lyre,
Whence holiest strains of glory rung—
The heart of love—the soul of fire—
Which o'er the chords their rapture flung.

Not Jordan's stream by morning light
Was purer than those strains of thine,
Nor Hermon's dews in summer night
E'er drank a spirit more divine.

In Palestine thine earliest lays
Thy Saviour's sainted pathway trod,
And in the hallowed breath of praise
Displayed his mission from his God.

Oh! meed of studies pure and blest,
None bent more eager at thy goal,
Nor e'er has Christian truth confest
A nobler mind, a loftier soul.

A spirit kindred to thy own
Inspired thy pen in later days,
And Taylor's genius fairer shone,
Touched by thy living words of praise.

Like him, Devotion's purest fount
Was well-spring of thy deep delight;
Like him, Moriah's glorious mount
The star that lit thy gloomiest night.

Where waves the palm on India's shore,
Thy faithful footsteps calmly trod;
From thy loved land the parting o'er,
Thine all was given to Heaven and God.

There, with a fervent, burning zeal,
Thy piety more meekly shone,—
The lonely Brahmin came to kneel,
And the blest Cross of Jesus own.

O'er pure and youthful brows thy hand
The Christian blessing softly spread,
And, bending at thy mild command,
In prayer was bowed each weeping head.

Thy Father marked thy perfect love,
The consecration of thy breast,
And, smiling from his throne of love,
He called thee to the realms of rest.

I. E. H.

GOOD TEMPER.

ONE swallow will not make a summer out of doors; but one face invariably cheerful, one temper never ruffled, one heart always affectionate, makes summer in a house.—*Quarterly Review*.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Cautions for the Times. Nos. I.—XV. Pp. 251. London—J. W. Parker.

THESE "Timely Cautions" are addressed to the Parishioners of a parish in England, by their former Rector, on account of the great and general excitement that arose throughout England in connection with steps lately taken by the rulers of the Romish Church. They are printed and published occasionally, in short and inexpensive numbers, fifteen of which have already appeared. Throughout almost the entire series, they shew the hand of a master—a hand not difficult to recognize by those who are familiar with his avowed writings—nor can anything surpass the clearness and power with which the writer exposes the assumptions and superstitions of the Romish Church. As these assumptions and superstitions are founded on fallacious representations of Christian truth and duty, the writer is necessarily led, in the course of his arguments, to assert and vindicate the real principles of Christian faith and obligation, not only as against the Romish Church in particular, but also as against every Church and every party, sceptics included, who would repudiate or lower the authority of reason or the obligation of private judgment in the affairs of religion, or who would impugn that basis of historical verity and special divine attestation, on which, as on a rock, Christ has built his Church. It is lamentable as well as curious to note, in some instances, to what shifts the writer is put in his endeavours to reconcile his fundamental principles with the very existence, as well as with the characteristic peculiarities, of the Church established by law; and how angrily he resents the attempt so seasonably made, by an eminent Nonconformist divine in that part of the United Kingdom in which his own ministrations are now exercised, to expose those errors in doctrine and discipline which this Church inherits from her elder sister of Rome: while in a subsequent part of the series, he himself commits the very fault (if fault it be) for which he censures his Nonconformist brother, by enlarging on the errors and superstitions of what is called the Tractite, or Tractarian, party in the Established Church. But these are slight blemishes, so far as regards this valuable series itself, in the midst of transcendent excellences, and, however they may affect our estimate of the writer, but slightly impair the value of his writings. Where almost everything is condensed and powerful, and constitutes part of a regular series of argumentation, it is difficult to select; but the two following passages will serve, perhaps, to shew the general character of the series, and induce our readers, we hope, to make themselves intimately acquainted with the whole of its very valuable contents.

1. *What questions in Religion every man must necessarily determine for himself, before he can rationally conclude that he is incompetent to decide such questions for himself at all.*

"Before a man can rationally judge that he should submit his judgment in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged, 1. That there is a God; 2. That Christianity comes from God; 3. That Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church; 4. That such authority resides in the Church of Rome. Now to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion, is very like saying that men may have sound judgments of their own *before* they enter the Church of Rome, but that they *lose* all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it."—P. 22.

2. *What are the most widely prevalent causes of that real want of faith which usurps to itself distinctively the name of faith.*

"Now when a man of competent ability disbelieves that which he might (if he would consider the matter) see to be the more probable thing, and believes what is the more improbable, it is because he is influenced by some prejudice

or other, which keeps him from applying his mind to the real state of the case. Such prejudices are very different in different persons. Sometimes it is love of antiquity; sometimes love of novelty; sometimes respect for authority; sometimes contempt for it; sometimes complaisance towards others; sometimes fondness for singularity, and love of opposition. Sometimes we feel that the thing proposed to us is 'too good news to be true;' sometimes we shrink from believing it true because it is disagreeable. But, in all cases, these prejudices produce want of genuine Faith—that is, they keep the mind from attending calmly to the evidence, and determining, by the weight of that, first our judgment, and then our conduct."—Pp. 176, 177.

With reference to this "evidence," which it is so much the fashion in these days among certain parties to decry, and especially as being altogether unsuitable to the mass of mankind, to poor and illiterate people, we were gratified to read the following statement, which we the rather insert for the purpose of earnestly recommending the "little book" to which it relates.

"After all, the best proof of the possibility of this [i. e. of making the lower classes at home understand the evidences of Christianity] is the matter of fact. You have now before you the *tenth* edition of a little book, *Introductory Lessons on Christian Evidences*, (John W. Parker and Son, London,) which has been found, by pretty large experience, capable of accomplishing that very thing which the persons noticed above pronounce impossible. Besides being reprinted in America, it has been, for several years, translated into French, Italian, Spanish, Welsh, German, Romaine [Modern Greek], Armenian, and Polish."—P. 183, note.

With these proofs of their efficiency and acceptance, we have no fear that the Evidences of Christianity will suffer more than a very partial and temporary disparagement; while we would urge upon those who, like ourselves, are convinced of their unspeakable value and indispensable necessity, to do all that in them lies to stem the torrent of spiritual assumption and credulity which at times threatens to overwhelm them; and to combine in strong and indissoluble union what it is at present the aim of too many to divorce,—the really consistent claims of judgment and feeling, of understanding and emotion, in connection with the infinitely momentous demands of Christian truth and righteousness.

B. B.

Memoirs of Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, with an Account of her Philanthropic Labours, in India, Australia and England, &c. By Eneas Mackenzie. 12mo. Pp. 187. London—Webb, Millington and Co. 1852.

THE name of Mrs. Chisholm is known and honoured in both hemispheres as a practical and truly Christian philanthropist. Taking under her protection emigrants, and particularly those of her own sex, a class of persons exposed to peculiar difficulties and temptations, she has saved or recovered numbers from what seemed hopeless ruin and infamy. She is a native of Northamptonshire; her father, Mr. William Jones, was a yeoman of Wootten, in that county. An accidental conversation with an old soldier, who described to her foreign countries, the beauty of the scenery, the excellence of the climate, and the abundance of food, and a correspondence carried on by her family with some American settlers, first turned her attention, when a very young girl, to the subject of emigration. The following statement from her own pen is abundantly curious, and may furnish food for the metaphysician to speculate on.

"My first attempt at *colonization* was carried on in a wash-hand basin, before I was seven years old. I made boats of broad beans; expended all my money in touchwood dolls; removed families, located them in the bed-quilt, and sent the boats, filled with wheat, back to their friends, of which I kept a store in a thimble-case. At length I upset the basin, which I judged to be a fac-simile of the sea, spoiled a new bed, got punished, and afterwards carried out my plan in a dark cellar, with a rushlight stuck upon a tin kettle; and, strange as it may seem, many of the ideas which I have since carried out first gained pos-

session of my mind at that period; and, singular as it may appear, *I had a Wesleyan minister and a Catholic priest in the same boat*. Two of my dolls were very refractory, and would not be obedient; this made me name them after two persons I knew who were always quarrelling, and I spent hours in listening to their supposed debates, to try and find out how I could manage them; at length I put the two into a boat, and told them if they were not careful they would be drowned; and having landed them *alive*, I knelt down to pray to God to make them love each other."—Pp. 3, 4.

Mrs. Chisholm is a Roman Catholic,—a fact which, we blush to record, has in some of our provincial towns occasioned jealousy, and the refusal of support to her benevolent plans, on the part of some who think themselves *par excellence* Protestants. What a rebuke to these narrow-minded persons is Mrs. Chisholm's record of her meditations at the altar on Easter Sunday, 1841!

"I promised to know *neither country nor creed*, but to try to serve all *justly* and impartially. I asked only to be enabled to keep these poor girls from being tempted by their need to mortal sin; and resolved that, to accomplish this, I would in every way sacrifice my feelings, surrender all comfort, nor, in fact, consider my own wishes or feelings, but wholly devote myself to the work I had in hand."

When twenty years of age, she married Captain A. Chisholm, of the Madras army. Two years after, they sailed for India, and immediately this excellent woman commenced the series of wisely-conceived and benevolent plans which have won for her a well-earned fame. The first objects of her regard were the children and orphans of soldiers, for whom she succeeded in establishing a school of industry, which has since proved an asylum for hundreds of this neglected and imperilled class.

The state of her husband's health compelled him and Mrs. Chisholm, then the mother of an infant family, to proceed, in 1838, to South Australia. Shocked with the depravity of morals she observed in Sydney, she gave all her leisure to the preservation of female emigrants, for whom she succeeded in establishing an Emigrants' Home. Gifted with indomitable energy and with remarkable natural eloquence, she has in every scene of her labours been enabled to overcome obstacles, and to enlist the aid of persons in every rank of life. At the present moment she is organizing and superintending in this country large schemes of emigration, and, with devotedness scarcely inferior to her own, her husband is carrying into effect her plans in Australia. Mr. Mackenzie's narrative is very imperfect, yet is full of interest, and discloses in the character of Caroline Chisholm the influence of "pure religion and undefiled."

Duty and Doctrine. A Sermon preached at the Annual Meeting of the Provincial Assembly of the Presbyterian and Unitarian Ministers of the Counties of Lancaster and Chester, held at Bolton-le-Moors, June 17, 1852.
By John Wright, B. A. London—Whitfield.

OF this excellent sermon we gave a sufficiently full account in the Intelligence department of a former No. How powerfully duty and doctrine are enforced, the following extract will shew.

"That body of men, that denomination of Christians, among whom there is the greatest effort to do God's will, will be most likely to know God's truth. We may find examples in history of bodies of Christians, who have set out with considerable advantages, in regard to purity of belief, extent of knowledge, and clearness of doctrinal view, but who have been puffed up with the notion that their only business was to sift every doubtful and disputed question to the bottom, and to retain—as they imagined they already possessed—a superiority over the rest of mankind in the correctness of their belief, and who, from the very fact of being thus satisfied with thinking instead of doing, with believing instead of working, with maturing their theological doctrine instead

of extending their Christian practice, have either fallen into a state of lethargy in moral and spiritual concerns, or have run into the extreme of sceptical doubts and difficulties. We may meet with others again, who have among them few men of learning, few deep thinkers, few skilled theologians, few religious philosophers, but who notwithstanding, from the purity of their hearts, the simplicity of their lives, the active charity of their united Christian exertions, have been led instinctively, or rather have been conducted by the aid of the spirit of God, to a knowledge of important truth, and a perception of glorious and eternal realities. We cannot, I believe, find any single example, in any age of Christianity, of a sect which has preserved purity of doctrine after it has lost purity of life, or which has even retained a high character with regard to its distinctive doctrines, when its adherents have become simply innocent from gross evil, have ceased to be active labourers in the cause of humanity."

One God the Father, the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. A Discourse preached in Little Portland-Street Chapel, June 2nd, 1852, before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association; and again at Swansea, July 21st, before the Western Unitarian Society. By Thomas Madge, Minister of Essex-Street Chapel. 8vo. Pp. 36. London—Whitfield. 1852.

MR. MADGE is at the head of that sect of sound-minded and earnest-hearted Unitarians who do not grow tired of what they have once deliberately adopted as Scripture truth; who believe that what is revealed in the gospel as Truth is equally fitted for all times and for all men. Some minds, less robust, have turned away with indifference almost amounting to disgust from the Unitarian controversy, as involving questions the importance of which is exploded,—which might interest a former age, but which have no hold on the better intelligence of the men of to-day. They who treat the doctrine of the Trinity as a mere metaphysical question, having no necessary bearing on piety and Christian morals—as, in short, a harmless error, shew their unacquaintance with both religious controversy and ecclesiastical history. The Unity is inseparably connected with the Character of God, and the views taken by Christians of the character of the Supreme Being will perpetually modify their faith and practice, either refining them and giving them vital power, or debasing them and diminishing their practical power. Thus earnestly does Mr. Madge in this vigorous sermon (the publication of which justifies the praises given to it by correspondents in former numbers of our Magazine) vindicate the importance and undying interest of the Unitarian controversy:

"With respect to the Unity of God, Is this, I ask, a doctrine which is held up to us in the Scriptures as of little or no importance? If this *were* the case, how can we account for the prominence which is given to it, both in Jewish and Christian dispensations? We may be sure that neither Moses nor Jesus would have been so emphatic in their assertion of it, placing it as they have done at the very head of the commandments, if it had not been regarded by them as one of the greatest moment. In maintaining, therefore, the doctrine of the Divine Unity, we are but obeying the injunction and following the example of Moses and the prophets, and of Him who is greater than the prophets. We cherish the conviction and delight in the contemplation of it, not only on account of its majestic simplicity and its intrinsic grandeur, but chiefly because of its close alliance with all honourable and delightful views of the character of God, and because it is the sheet-anchor of a firm and durable faith, of that faith which connects reason and piety and hope and charity in one great bond of everlasting union. They who think that we unduly estimate its value and importance should tell us why a departure from it has almost always been followed by the reception of other doctrines, which we feel to be repugnant to our reason and revolting to our hearts. How is it, I ask, that gross misconceptions of the nature of God have been everywhere attended with gross misconceptions of the character of God? If there were no tie that linked the one to the other, why is it that they are so generally found co-existing together, and seldom or never apart and separate from each other? It is notorious, that let a

man pass from a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity to that of the strict Unity of God, and the result commonly is, the rejection of other popular doctrines, such as those of original sin, everlasting punishment, and the satisfaction made to divine justice by the death of Christ. For this reason it is that we are desirous of forming for ourselves, and, as far as we are able, of imparting to others, just views upon this great question."—Pp. 26, 27.

The Treasure-Seeker's Daughter; a Tale of the Days of James the First.
By Hannah Lawrance. Pp. 256. London—Cockshaw.

THE previous publications in the "Library of the Times" have been biographical and historical. Here we have a short historical novel, designed to set before us the manners, superstitions and ecclesiastical persecutions which prevailed in England in the 17th century. The authoress introduces us into the court of James I., and represents skilfully enough the pedantry of the monarch and the obsequiousness of his courtiers, including Bacon, the glory and the shame of that age; also into the council of a city parish, presided over by an unscrupulous Doctor of Divinity anxious to be a Bishop, and willing to buy court favour at any price. The Treasure-seeker is an aged enthusiast, whose head is filled with visions of cabalistic magic. Before his death, under the influence of pure religious feeling, he breaks his wand and burns his books of incantation. The daughter, a pure and high-minded woman, is thrown into prison, professedly on account of religious nonconformity, but in reality on account of her refusal to assist in some magical spells required by the Countess of Buckingham. Slight glimpses are given us of the Pilgrim Fathers preparing to sail in the Mayflower. The authoress has evidently spared no labour in making herself well acquainted with the history, biography and social costume of the age she essays to illustrate. Here and there, the richness of her material has perhaps tempted her to crowd her canvas with too many figures and objects. This criticism applies chiefly to the first portion of her book. When she enters more earnestly into the plot of her story, it becomes very interesting. We had marked several passages for extract, but find them all too long for insertion, and must content ourselves with recommending the entire tale to our readers' perusal.

A Course of Christian Instruction for Sunday-Schools and Families.

UTTERANCE has often been given at the anniversary meetings of the friends of Sunday-schools, of a feeling of the want of a book or books containing systematic religious instruction for the young. In the series of little books of which we give the general title above, this want is attempted to be supplied by seven of not the least able and zealous of the American Unitarian ministers. The course consists of eight Text-books, containing for the most part about thirty Lessons each. This number of Lessons, together with the necessary repetition of some of them, and occasional unavoidable interruptions, will, it is conceived, pretty well occupy the year. Each Lesson is designed to occupy about half an hour. The first book, entitled, "Early Religious Lessons," containing extracts from Scripture and illustrative passages of poetry, is designed for all pupils in the school under ten years of age. Each exercise is to be thoroughly fixed in the pupil's memory. The teacher's work will be to explain and illustrate each Lesson. A text-book to aid the teacher in this would, in this country at least, be very serviceable. No. 2 in the series, entitled, "Palestine and the Hebrew People," is designed for pupils between ten and eleven. It is in the form of question and answer, and copious references to Scripture supply the teacher with the means of illustrative matter. No. 3 is entitled, "Lessons from the Old Testament," for pupils of eleven years of age. No. 4, for the pupils of the next year, is entitled, "Scenes from the Life of Jesus;" the order of events adopted is that proposed by Dr. Carpenter in his *Harmony of the Gospels*. No. 5, for pupils in their four-

teenth year, is entitled, "The Books and Characters of the New Testament," and gives briefly and plainly the *results* of inquiries into the history of the New-Testament Scriptures. No. 6, entitled, "Lessons upon Religious Duties and Christian Morals," is for pupils in their fifteenth year. No. 7 enters on the more difficult ground of the "Doctrines of Scripture," and is reserved for pupils in their sixteenth year. No. 8 is for pupils between sixteen and seventeen. The subject is, "Scenes from Christian History." A very interesting book it is. The cumbrous form of question and answer is here properly dispensed with. We think the same might have been done with advantage in the case of several of the preceding works. The whole of these manuals appear to us to be executed with knowledge, taste and skill. There is throughout them a tone of reverent Christian feeling, lacking which, books for Sunday scholars will never effect their highest purpose. Here and there, we meet with some statement or deduction to which a critical quære might be annexed, or a positive objection made; but instances of this kind are as few as can be anticipated in works composed by various authors, each exercising the right of private judgment. For our own parts, we cannot subscribe to the doctrine of *intuition* of God's existence, alleged by the author of No. 7, and we find no support whatever for it in the single passage adduced by him in its behalf. The writer says that this intuition is "born with us and suggests an idea of God, and starts the mind on trains of inquiry," &c., &c. He admits, indeed, that this intuition is "imperfect and vague." It had better, therefore, not be adduced by a Theist in proof of God's existence. Possibly, in making this objection we may expose ourselves, in the estimation of some persons, to the imputation of "grave and ruinous infidelity;" but in the course of duty we will brave this censure from a Unitarian brother, however ill we may think it becomes him to utter it, with the same firmness that we would oppose to bigotry like that of the Athanasian Creed.—We have only to add to our approving and grateful notice of this series of books for the Sunday-school, that they are the works of Rev. G. W. Briggs, S. G. Bulfinch, R. Ellis, E. E. Hale, F. D. Huntington, J. H. Morison and E. Peabody. It is to their honour that they have devoted their knowledge and talents in aid of the Sunday scholar.

Journal of a Residence in Norway, during the Years 1834, 1835 and 1836; made with a view to Inquire into the Moral and Political Economy of that Country, and the Condition of its Inhabitants. By Samuel Laing, Esq. New Edition. Pp. 306. Longman.

WE are glad to receive from the publisher of the "Travellers' Library" a new and inexpensive edition of Mr. Laing's very remarkable and instructive account of the Norwegian people and their institutions. Mr. Laing traces the high moral and social position of Norway primarily to the general diffusion of property among all classes and individuals, and the absence of the feudal law of primogeniture. The description given by Mr. Laing of the character and influence of the clergy is well worthy of serious consideration, and presents a very remarkable contrast to the state of the clergy in England.

"When we consider the great extent of the Norwegian parishes, the merit of being laborious, zealous and effective, cannot be denied to the Norwegian clergy. The church service is the smallest part of their duty, although the sermon is long, and delivered, as in Scotland, without papers. They have school examinations, Sunday-schools, meetings of those who are in preparation for being confirmed, often at great distances from their dwellings, and a superintendence of the probst, or bishop, which prevents any neglect or indolence in attending to those duties.

"It is my impression, that the Norwegian clergy are a highly-educated body of men. As far as my experience goes, the clergy and students of divinity are acquainted with the literature of Europe, have read the standard works in

the French and German languages, and are at least as well acquainted with English as our clergy in general are with French.

"The study of the great works on divinity, philosophy and church history which have been written in the German language, is a necessary part of the course here for the student of divinity. The classical studies are also carried to a later period of life than in Scotland, by those intended for the clerical profession, and under teachers of a high scholarship. * * * In proportion also to the other professional classes in the community, the clergy of Norway are richly endowed, and the church has always been the highest profession in the country, that to which all talent is naturally directed."

It militates somewhat against the correctness of Mr. Laing's representations of the high intellectual cultivation of the clergy of Norway, that hitherto their contributions to theological literature have been comparatively unimportant. The amount of daily work due from the clergy may, however, in some degree account for it. Nonconformity to the Lutheran Church has, it seems, no place in Norway.

"It is a peculiar characteristic of the Norwegian Church, that there is no dissent from it, no sectarians. A few years ago, a person of the name of Houghan had a few followers; but his doctrine on religious points did not differ from that of the established church. It was his object to inspire a more religious spirit, and more strict observance of the church doctrine; so that his followers were similar to what is called the evangelical part of the community of the Church of England. But even this slight attempt at division, within the pale of the church itself, appears to have had no success.

"There are several reasons for this peculiarity of the Norwegian Church. The principal, perhaps, is, that it has no temporal power; no political existence as a part of the State; no courts, or laws, or interests of its own jarring with those of the other classes of the community, and raising animosity between them and the clergy. The clergy are, in political rights and privileges, on the same footing as any other class of the community. The Lutheran religion is part of the State; but not the ministers who are employed to teach it. They are represented in the Storting like other citizens, and, having no separate interests as a body of clergy, enjoy individually the confidence of the people, and an unity of interests with them. They are often sent to the Storting as their representatives. This unity of worldly interests prevents dissent in spiritual matters." P. 124.

Our dignified clergy will, we imagine, scarcely consent to adopt Norwegian habits and practices, even for the sake of extinguishing Dissent.

We have only room for one extract more, which may suggest to the managers of Bible Societies the inexpediency of depriving booksellers and agents of their accustomed profits.

"I was surprised, on inquiring at the only bookseller's shop for a New Testament in the Norwegian tongue, to find that he kept none. I thought at first that he had misunderstood me, but really found that he did not keep any of late years. As he understood German, I asked him how, in a population of 12,000 people, the only bookseller kept no stock of Testaments and Bibles. He said that country booksellers did not find it answer, as the Bible Society in London had once sent out a stock which was sold much lower than the trade could afford, and it was only after the Society's Bibles were sold that they could get clear of what they had in hand; hence they could not venture to keep any now. It is plain, that if any benevolent society were to supply a parish with boots and shoes below prime cost, until all the shoemakers in the parish had turned to other employments, the parish would soon be barefooted, and that they would do more harm than good, unless they had funds to continue the supply for ever. This bookseller, a very respectable man, laid no stress upon the circumstance; but simply explained it, as he might have answered any other inquiry about books; and a bookbinder, whom I afterwards saw, gave me the same reason. Men of the first capacity are connected with our societies for the distribution of the Scriptures; and it may well deserve their consideration, whether such distributions may not in the long run do more harm than good. If the ordinary mode of supplying human wants, by affording a fair

remuneration to those who bring an article to where it was wanted, be invaded, they may be interfering with, and stopping up, the natural channels by which society must in the long run be supplied with religious books."—P. 79.

Sermons in the Order of a Twelvemonth. By N. L. Frothingham. Pp. 363. Boston—Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1852.

MR. FROTHINGHAM should preach to somnolent hearers, for he, if any one can do it, will keep them awake and attentive by his vivacity of manner, the variety and novelty of both his subjects and illustrations; and if they be persons of any cultivation of taste, he will charm them by the beautiful pictures which he presents to their contemplation. The volume consists of two-and-thirty Sermons, having no particular connection one with another,—the first two suited to New-Year's day, the last two to winter-time and the close of the year, and the intervening Sermons, as far as the subjects permit, arranged in the succession of feast-days and fast-days and seasons of the year.

Mr. Frothingham loves to startle his hearers—a habit which, if not kept in subordination to good taste, would lead to incongruity and expose the preacher to ridicule. He copies from our old Puritan divines the taste for odd subjects and quaint titles. In the choice of his texts he is generally remarkable, sometimes felicitous. He deals largely in symbolism, and evidently enjoys the wonder which the symbol, abruptly presented to his perplexed flock, excites. Few could equal him in the explanation and application of the moral or the doctrine symbolized. In another respect Mr. Frothingham is utterly unlike our older divines, for he is terse and brief,—often throwing down a pithy sentence full of closely-compacted thought, and leaving it to the hearer to unroll it and in his own thoughts to enlarge upon it.

We should be doing Mr. Frothingham injustice if we were not to these remarks to add, that the aim of all his discourses is serious and essentially religious, although now and then the topics may be unwonted in the pulpit, and, judged by a strict standard, deemed grotesque.

We will not attempt a review of these Sermons, but will present to our readers one or two passages as specimens of the lively thoughts and sentences, brilliant sentences which are to be found in nearly every page. Few preachers would have found in the words, "*Forty stripes save one*" (2 Cor. xi. 24), a text on the doctrine of forbearance. If the deduction of the subject from the text had been far less ingenious than it is, we would have forgiven it for the sake of the following passage on the philosophy of the whip, which we select because it will satisfy such of our friends as make this the test and condition of their communion with American brethren in the ministry, that Mr. Frothingham does not spare the task-master and the slave-owner.

"It may seem strange to you to associate any thought of benevolence with the whip. To us, it is the very emblem of oppression and brutality. We have seen its bad power departing from it, and still to depart. Within our own times it has been dropping from the hands of legislation. About half a century ago it was exercised judicially for the last time in our own streets. Mankind are beginning to look on with disgust, as it is lifted by a task-master over the back of a slave. The benevolence of the world is expecting that it shall be given wholly up, even in the quarters where it has hitherto been absolute. That the ship shall hear no more the sound of it, nor reckon it among its implements of safety, but find it enough for the poor mariner to bear the lash of the angry wind and the beating sea. That it shall be banished from the very camps where men are trained to destroy one another. In that smaller camp, a school, we have known boys to be trained to different and peaceful purposes by a similar barbarity. But here too all is changing. The old savagery relents or grows ashamed. The scourge has become but the shadow of its former self. More than one out of forty of its marks are left uninflicted. The days of its terror are numbered. The ensign of a Roman lictor was an axe tied about with rods. But in the gracious course of time, that grim centre-

piece is known only as a tool of cheerful industry in the grasp of the woodman and the builder. May we not hope that the bundle of rods shall become as obsolete as the axe? But we must consider that these are the views of modern civilization, and that we should not try by their standard the customs of remote times. Enough, if we have discovered, in this part of the institutions of the greatest lawgiver of antiquity, one of its many signs of pity. Enough, that the language of the text may serve to exhibit to our minds, as in a figure, the law of a merciful forbearance, among the judgments and stern corrections of life."—Pp. 178, 179.

Some beautiful passages occur in different sermons in this volume respecting the religious ancestors of the New-England churches. Thus in the sermon on the annual Fast-day, entitled, "The Symbolism of a Fast:"

"Our pilgrim forefathers, while they brought to these shores a spirit of fasting, arising out of the austere and solemn character of their religious faith, and the oppressive circumstances that drove them self-banished from their well-furnished homes to a land of wants, found here also other circumstances that deepened in their minds that spirit. The supplies of life were extremely uncertain for them. The Indian savage was their neighbour, and their narrow inclosures pressed upon the wilderness. They tilled the soil with anxious hands and small returns. If we look over the early public records of their little colonies, we find that drought and blasting and mildew are bewailed as incidents of the most common occurrence. When they cast the year's hope into the dark earth, the heavens seemed to weep over them in the falling showers; and their eyes were not always dry while they saw how gloomily, under shadow and rain, Nature made preparation for her slow and uncertain stores; and it was no formal seriousness that clouded their faces, when at this season they bowed themselves in earnest supplication before Him who alone giveth the increase. What was more natural or affecting, than that they should have set apart a day for the general expression of what was in all their hearts; and that, in token of their humble feeling and dependent state, they should abstain from tasting of the productions, which it was doubtful if God would that year renew and keep for them."—Pp. 67, 68.

Treatise on the Christian Religion. Edited, with Alterations, from the French of Athanase Coquerel, Pastor of the Reformed Church in Paris. 18mo. Pp. 144. London—Whitfield. 1852.

THE translator states in the Preface—"M. Coquerel is a distinguished minister of the Reformed Church in Paris. According to an excellent custom, which obtains abroad, young persons, previously to their first communion at the Table of the Supper, attend upon their pastor to receive from him a complete course of religious instruction. M. Coquerel has long used this little treatise with the classes which have been under his charge with great success."

We have looked through this manual with interest and pleasure. It contains a very large amount of religious and scriptural truth. Here and there, in the introductory chapters, it is unnecessarily metaphysical for very young persons. It is most gratifying to find that a Christianity is taught to the youthful members of the Reformed Church, so immeasurably in advance of other European Churches calling themselves Reformed. The translator is, we presume, a Unitarian. It is not stated to what extent alterations have been made, or of what nature they are, but we presume there is no important variation in the theology of the original work and the translation.

The Principles of English Punctuation, preceded by brief Explanations of the Parts of Speech. By George Smallfield. London—Whitfield. 1852.

THIS useful little treatise by the late Mr. Smallfield, having been long out of print, is reprinted by one of his sons. It is concise and plain, and may be safely recommended to all who desire to acquire correct habits of punctuation.

INTELLIGENCE.

Ministers' Benevolent Society.

We observe with satisfaction that Mr. Frederick Russell is encouraged by the address of the Unitarian ministers who recently assembled at the ordination at Stourbridge, requesting him to take immediate steps for bringing into operation the Ministers' Benevolent Society, to call an early meeting of those interested in the plan, to be held in the Midland counties. The meeting is called for Tuesday, Oct. 12, in the vestry of the New Meeting, Birmingham. It will be remembered that Mr. Russell, at considerable inconvenience and some cost to himself, gave to London during the Whitsun-week the opportunity of inaugurating the Society, respecting the necessity of which there had been throughout the country such (as we conceive) unmistakeable expressions of opinion. Influenced by some singular misconceptions respecting the nature of the proposed society,—misconceptions so rooted in the mind, that all the attempts of clear and strong-minded men like Messrs. Bache, Higginson and Gordon to dispel the prejudice proved unavailing,—certain ministers and lay gentlemen gave so strong an opposition to Mr. Russell's plans, that the opportunity for action passed away, and the only result of the meeting was the appointment of a committee of inquiry. To what conclusion that committee has arrived, we know not. In due time they will, we presume, make known the result of their deliberations. We cannot be surprised at the desire of the ministers in the Midland counties to make the experiment of a second meeting in another locality. We trust it will be numerously attended, and that some definite and well-conceived scheme for improving the present condition of Unitarian ministers will be the result. In the mean time, that we may do what we can to remove misconception, we will briefly remind our readers of the general features of the plan recommended by Mr. Russell.

Mr. Russell's plan contemplates simply the relief of aged or infirm ministers retired from active service, and of the widows and families of deceased

ministers. Its objects are nearly analogous to those of the Lancashire and Cheshire *Widows' Fund*, the benefits of which are well known in the North of England. The increase of poor working salaries is no part of Mr. Russell's scheme. Admitting the importance of that object (which, we believe, will in its turn be undertaken on an appropriately large scale), Mr. R. confines himself to a department which he sees to be immediately practicable, as enabling ministers themselves to make the best of their present circumstances; while he trusts to a larger and more costly organization (yet to be formed) to improve the circumstances of the poorest ministers in *actual service*, out of some future general fund which may more than supply the place of the lost Hewley endowment, not for the North of England only, but for the whole country.

The Benevolent Fund now proposed will (as we understand it) be of the nature of a Mutual Insurance Fund to the extent of each minister being required to subscribe annually in order to claim its benefits, and being entitled to claim those benefits for himself or family in case of the contemplated need. But it will be also of the nature of a Benevolent Fund in seeking further help from laymen and from congregational collections, which will, in proportion to its amount, make the available aid to superannuated ministers and the families of deceased ministers, it may be, double or triple that which would accrue on the calculations of an actuary from the mere average of life and health chances.

Such is, in outline, the plan for the Ministers' Benevolent Fund;—contemplating the same purposes, with essentially the same means, as the Benefit Societies and Sick Clubs of the Artizan classes, as the Benevolent Societies of the Medical profession (his experience of which immediately suggested to the late Mr. Russell his plan for the Unitarian ministry), as the Societies of Artists, the recent "Guild of Literature," and (most immediately parallel to it) the Fund for Ministers of the Independent denomination, lately taken up with the wonted zeal of that body.

OBITUARY.

DR. LEDLIE.

Aug. 12, at Dublin, in his sixty-seventh year, the Rev. J. C. LEDLIE, D.D.

The Rev. Dr. Drummond, having preached on the Fear of Death, concluded by giving a sketch of the life and character of the Rev. Dr. Ledlie, in nearly the following terms.

My Christian friends, I have now addressed you at some length, on a subject of such profound interest to us all, that I cannot suppose it inappropriate to another topic which now claims our attention. This congregation has very recently lost one of its pastors, suddenly and unexpectedly, by the hand of death. Only two weeks have elapsed since he occupied the place where I now stand. At that time, indeed, some symptoms of illness were observed in his countenance, but neither he nor his friends had any apprehension of danger, and he was always reluctant to be found absent at the appointed hour from his station in the house of God. He grew rapidly worse; medical aid was unavailing; the stamina of life gave way; he expired without apparent suffering, without a murmur or a groan, and in such an easy mode of dying as he was known to have said he would prefer, were it at his own option.

I now proceed to give a brief biographical sketch of our departed friend.

Dr. JAMES CRAWFORD LEDLIE was born of pious, respectable parents in the county of Tyrone, A.D. 1785. It was probably the wish of his parents from the time of his birth that he should be educated with a view to the Presbyterian ministry. Accordingly, he was early and well instructed in the Latin and Greek languages, and at the age of 15 he entered, as a student, the University of Glasgow, where at that time almost all the Presbyterian ministers of the North of Ireland completed their academical course. He carried with him a belief in those religious doctrines which he had been taught, the truth of some of which, however revolting to reason and scripture, he had, possibly, never heard questioned. His intercourse at College with some young men of superior talents opened his mind to a better understanding of the Scriptures, and consequently to the reception of more Christian doctrines than some of those contained in the creeds of Calvin and Knox. He soon became distinguished among his class-fellows by diligent application to his studies, and by his eminent success in ob-

taining prizes for superior proficiency in College exercises. He also obtained a silver medal, a reward not often conferred on Irish students in that University, and returned to his native soil crowned with academical honours. He then turned his attention to the ministry, connected himself with the Presbytery of Tyrone, and having passed most satisfactorily through their preparatory examinations, he became a licentiate of that ecclesiastical body—at that time, I presume, one of the most liberal Presbyteries of the Synod of Ulster, and distinguished by the name of a Non-subscribing Presbytery; i.e. they did not insist as an indispensable condition, a *sine quâ non*, that every licentiate of theirs should subscribe the Westminster Confession. At least, in the case of Dr. Ledlie, subscription was not required, for he then, as ever afterwards, was most decidedly hostile to such an imposition on Christian freedom.

As a young and promising preacher, he soon became popular, and being chosen by the congregation of Donegore, in the county of Antrim, he was, at the age of 20, ordained their pastor. He also joined the Presbytery of Templepatrick, at that time a non-subscribing Presbytery, and felt himself quite free to preach the gospel as he could best understand it, without any check or restraint from the unhal- lowed imposition of human creeds. After two years' acceptable service to the congregation of Donegore, on the removal of the Rev. James Worrall from Larne to Clonmel, he received an unanimous "call" to the vacant pulpit of the First Presbyterian congregation of Larne, a most respectable, Christian-minded people, with whom it may be deemed no small honour to any member of society to be connected. During his College course in Glasgow, he secured the friendship and esteem of Professor Mylne, and also of a student of kindred spirit, who afterwards obtained and now holds the Professorship of Moral Philosophy in that University. With Dr. Buchanan, the name of this gentleman, he continued to keep up an occasional correspondence; and in 1828, Dr. Buchanan, mindful of his early friend's worth, and the estimable character which he had merited and obtained as a Christian minister, proposed to the Council of the College that the degree of D.D. should be conferred on him. The proposal was received in the most gratifying manner, and carried by acclamation,

In a discourse delivered last Lord's-day to the Larne congregation, the Rev. Clason Porter, speaking of his predecessor, said, "On his labours amongst you during twenty-four years of ministerial duty, I forbear to dilate. But his successor must ever gratefully acknowledge that to his timely exertions to instruct those who waited on his ministry in the pure doctrines of Christ's holy gospel, as distinguished from the unauthorized additions of uninspired men, he is mainly indebted for that comparative immunity from religious controversy which he has hitherto been permitted to enjoy, as well as for the unspeakable blessing of a united, a rationally assured, and a firmly attached body of people."

In 1832, Dr. Ledlie complied with the unanimous wish of the congregation of Eustace Street in Dublin, and became their junior pastor. As a strong mutual attachment between him and his people in Larne had subsisted so long, some wondered how he had ever consented to leave them. But he had some valid reasons for making the change, which few, if any, in similar circumstances, would hesitate to accept. He has himself stated that "the support which the congregation of Eustace Street were then enabled to offer him from their endowments, and the prospect of a maintenance for those dearest to him on earth, when he should be no more, together with the hope of finding a situation better adapted to that bodily infirmity under which he had laboured since childhood, and which he felt to be increasing with increasing years, were amongst the motives that led him to wish for a change."

In the regular and faithful discharge of his pastoral duties, and in the society of dearly attached friends who knew and could appreciate his worth, Dr. L. passed his days in the enjoyment of as much happiness as mortal man can reasonably expect. But the scene which had long been bright and serene became clouded; ominous threatenings were heard of some disastrous change; and he was destined to undergo a tedious and distressing trial, of which he could have no foresight, and which he might have deemed it impossible to be planned and carried into execution in an age and country boastful of enlightenment and freedom. As this was the most trying circumstance in the life of our friend, and one which exhibited his manly character in a proper light, it cannot be passed lightly over, nor ought such an example to be lightly esteemed. If, therefore, I trespass on your time and patience, I crave your friendly indulgence.

It seemed as if the spirit of Antichrist, stirred by envy and hatred to see the Christian societies composing the Synod of Munster so comfortable and so happy in the enjoyment of their religious rights, had determined to molest and destroy them. Fitting agents of persecution were found to conspire and devise a comprehensive scheme of spoliation and robbery. There were certain laws which in the lapse of years had become obsolete, but which might be revived, and if carried into effect would annihilate Unitarianism, and exterminate those religious societies which maintain, as we are taught in the gospel, that the Father alone is the supreme Object of true Christian worship. Such societies, in a less enlightened age, had been condemned as heterodox and heretical, and therefore not only not to be tolerated, but to be rooted out. Accordingly, certain claims, having no alliance with humanity or justice, were boldly advanced, and which, if successful, would have deprived us of all our houses of worship—robbed us of funds left by the pious liberality of our forefathers for the support of the Protestant Dissenting interest—robbed us of the very provision made for the support of our ministers' widows—and turned our pastors adrift on the wide world to seek a subsistence where and how they could. The scheme was in full operation, and so near its completion, as its agents thought, that they had actually begun to quarrel about the division of the spoil—and indeed all this atrocious cruelty would have been perpetrated without pity or remorse, had not the wisdom and justice of the Legislature timely interposed, and by the Dissenters' Chapels Bill rescued us, though not without grievous expenses, from the fangs of the oppressors.

Our English Unitarian friends had experienced a similar persecution, which was, indeed, a remote cause of that which assailed us. About the beginning of the last century, Lady Hewley, a pious and benevolent lady, had left certain funds for the support of poor ministers of Christ's holy gospel, without specifying any particular articles, orthodox or heterodox, in which it would be necessary for the recipients of the bounty to make profession of belief. In the regular, legitimate course of succession, the descendants of Lady Hewley's fellow-worshippers, and some of her own family, had become avowed Unitarians; but as their doctrines were out of the pale of legal protection, a plot was devised to take away all their property, and give it to those who could subscribe certain creeds devised by falli-

ble men. The plot, after long litigation, succeeded; the property of the Unitarians was wrested from them; and they who went to law to "defraud their brethren" triumphed. Their success inflamed the cupidity of their brethren in Ireland. In this country were certain properties, belonging to the two congregations of Strand Street and Eustace Street, similarly circumstanced to those left by Lady Hewley. The prize was tempting. A plot was contrived. Certain disciples of Calvin conspired to seize it for their own benefit. They found a kindred spirit, possessed of extraordinary power and influence in the lower Castle-yard (of Dublin), whom they selected as their leader and guide. A most vexatious and expensive law-suit was commenced in the Court of Chancery. On their side was some obsolete law which declared it illegal to impugn the doctrine of the Trinity; on ours was long uninterrupted possession, the law of right, the law of humanity, the law of justice, the law of truth, the law of God; but the law of man prevailed, and the spoliators enjoyed one guilty triumph in gaining possession of the fund then known by the name of the General Fund, but which is general now no longer.

During these proceedings our lamented friend was no idle nor unconcerned spectator, nor could he have been such even in a business which touched him less closely. He was too earnest a supporter of the great principles of civil and religious liberty and of the rights of conscience ever to see them violated without indignation. He felt keenly for the wrongs that he and his brethren seemed destined to suffer. He laboured strenuously to avert the impending calamity; he collected documents to invalidate the pretensions of the spoliator, and wrote and published such letters, explanatory of the justice of his cause and of the cruel wrongs he and his friends must suffer if the enemy should succeed, as called forth the sympathy and admiration, not only of honest and just men at home, but in the sister island, and with such warm and cordial expressions of kindness, as tended in no small degree to blunt the poignancy of his feelings. The following communication from a learned and generous-minded minister of the gospel in Manchester* may illustrate these observations:

"At the periodical meeting of Unitarian ministers of Manchester and the neighbourhood, held March 14, 1844, the following resolution was unanimously carried:

"That the members of this meeting have heard Dr. Ledlie's Letters with great interest, and wish to express to him, through their Chairman, their brotherly sympathy with him, and their admiration of the excellent spirit, as well as the great ability, which he has shewn in his history and statement of the case of the Eustace-Street congregation, Dublin." This resolution is followed by the expression of a wish "that some copies of the Letters should be printed for distribution, as the statements and principles they so forcibly exhibit cannot be too generally known, and that a hundred copies should be sent to them for circulation in that part of England."

The remaining part of the letter is so worthy of its excellent author, and of its subject, that no apology for introducing it here can be necessary.

"We can hardly think," says he, "that a decision so obviously unjust as that announced by the Chancellor, will be ultimately confirmed and allowed to take effect. But should it be so, I for my part cannot doubt that a sense of the grievous wrong you have suffered, combined with our admiration of your own manly and honourable conduct, will rouse throughout the whole body of the friends of religious freedom, such deep interest and sympathy, as will prevent you and your family from feeling the full effect of the very extraordinary persecution with which you have been visited. I think I can answer for myself and several friends that we shall not be wanting in efforts, if unhappily they should be required. Nay, I will even hope that the cause of truth and liberty may be ultimately served by these temporary wrongs."

Such expressions of generous sympathy from our English brethren were most grateful and consolatory to our friend. At home, too, there were many who warmly participated in his feelings, and many Christians of different denominations felt and breathed strong indignation at the selfish and unprincipled schemes to defraud him and his brethren of their possessions. At one time, when the issue of the legal proceedings seemed doubtful, an attempt was made on the part of the enemies to have the business compromised. But finding that they could have no chance of success in making Dr. Ledlie a participator in their evil deeds—for it seems they had the egregious folly to suppose he had as little regard for honour and integrity as they had themselves, and that, like one or two others on whom their craft had been successfully employed, he might be tempted to desert

* The Rev. John James Tayler.

or betray his brethren—they thought they might prevail on the affections of a wife and mother, for her own sake, for the sake of her husband and children, to become their ally. She was told of the misery and destitution in which she and the whole family would be involved—that the only mode of averting such a catastrophe was for her husband at once to succumb, i. e. to prove himself a traitor to his own cause, the cause of his people and the cause of God—and that he and his wife and children should be well provided for and well guarded against the common ruin. How such scandalous and insulting overtures were received by a stout-hearted, high-principled woman, may be imagined. Happily, the British Legislature interposed just in time to avert the intended spoliation, and our venerated friend was saved from the sad necessity, which he once almost anticipated, of having to “seek in the evening of his days a new occupation and a distant home.” That necessity, as is now generally known, has befallen the principal agent in the nefarious persecution; and in that man’s history is exemplified the truth of the scriptural proverbs, that “the counsels of the wicked are deceit” —“the robbery of the wicked shall destroy them.”

From that time forward until the end of his pilgrimage, there was no occurrence requiring particular notice. After the storm came a calm, and we have been suffered to pursue the even tenor of our way without molestation. In the life of a minister of the gospel who has the charge of a congregation, there are few incidents so exciting and distressing as that which has been mentioned. Happily such times of persecution have passed away, let us hope for ever; but we are not to relax our vigilance, nor suppose that our temporal, as well as our spiritual, enemies will not be always ready to take every advantage of our supineness, and prosecute their own unhallowed and selfish designs at our expense. It is our duty to persevere through good report and through ill report, and do all we ought and all we can to support the great principles on which we stand, and which were so ably supported by our lamented friend. You, my friends, who knew him best, could best appreciate his worth. To you, who enjoyed his society and friendship, I only echo your own sentiments when I state that he stood high in the scale of intellect, that he possessed a clear and discerning judgment, and in the knowledge and discharge of his professional duties was worthy of high ap-

probation. As a Protestant Dissenting minister, who in all matters of religious faith and practice took the Scriptures as his only guide, he was steady, unwavering and consistent; and able to give an answer to every man that asked him a reason of the hope that was in him. Firm and courageous, able as he was willing to support and defend his own principles, he was never intolerant to others, but was ever ready to extend unto all the same liberty which he claimed as his birthright for himself. As a preacher he was in elocution clear and distinct, impressive and easily understood—in his subjects, moral, practical, and, when occasion offered or circumstances required, argumentative, logical, energetic. He taught not for doctrines the commandments of men, nor for the great truths of revelation substituted the dogmas of polemics; neither did he utter sound for sense, nor words for arguments; he did not mystify his hearers, nor darken counsel by words without knowledge; but ably and convincingly employed both reason and revelation in inculcating such doctrines as make men wiser and happier, and lead to eternal salvation; in all things following the apostle’s admonition in “showing himself a pattern of good works; in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, and sound speech that cannot be condemned.” No friend to display or ostentation, or unmeaning ceremonies, “in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly or worldly wisdom, he had his conversation in the present world.” In the several relations of life, public, social, domestic, he gave an example worthy of imitation. Suffice it to say that he was a tender and affectionate husband and father, a faithful friend, an honest and judicious adviser. In the family circle and in social intercourse, he was ever cheerful and fruitful in topics of amusing and instructive conversation. His removal leaves a sad blank in the society of those who have long been accustomed to enjoy it. May He who pours consolation on the afflicted, and binds up the wounds of the broken in heart, soothe and console the fatherless and widow in their affliction! And may you, dear friends and brethren, as you respect and venerate the memory of your deceased pastor, abide faithfully in those principles and that practice which it was his delight to inculcate and exemplify; and if departed spirits have any participation of feeling with the inhabitants of earth, the knowledge that he has not spoken in vain, nor in vain endeavoured to direct

you in the paths which lead to happiness and heaven, will fill his soul with joy.

WILLIAM WINSTANLEY, M.D.

There are those to whom it is due that they should not disappear from the circles in which they have been beloved, and from the earthly scene which their virtues have adorned, without some tribute paid to their excellencies—some effort of affection to preserve the memory of what they were by a delineation (however faint) of their characters, and by a faithful record of their course through life. This is especially felt in the case of those, the quality of whose merits, and the native delicacy of whose minds, placed them through life at the greatest distance from all pretension and display; and who, in the possession of very superior talents and of correspondent virtues, endeared themselves inexpressibly, in the most modest exercise of these, to those who were privileged to witness and had the happiness to profit by them. Veneration and gratitude cleave to the memories of those so revered and so beloved in life. They prompt the wish to trace and exhibit to view the features of exemplary excellence in the departed. Such a testimony of esteem is here rendered to the late Dr. WILLIAM WINSTANLEY, and it is consecrated to the interests of virtue and of truth.

Dr. Winstanley was one of those fitted by the force of natural abilities to take position in society; his abilities had received the improvement derived from the advantages of education and sound mental cultivation; and consideration and esteem accompanied him through life. But the talents in him which in the service of ambition might have led to eminence and distinction in some of its walks, associated with the principles and virtues which were also his, served only to make him a wise and good man, who found the sphere of his duties and enjoyments in the ordinary relations of life, in which he was a blessing to all with whom he was connected, by the purity of his example and the benevolence of his heart. No one who knew him and could appreciate his intellectual character, could fail to be sensible of his quickness of apprehension, and the clearness and acuteness of his perceptions, the soundness of his judgment, and the general strength of his understanding. A certain rectitude of understanding (so to express it) remarkably characterized him—a rectitude of understanding, the result, no doubt, in part of that rectitude of

temper, principle and disposition which, accompanying in him every exercise of the intellect, brought the whole character into harmony, and gave it its unity and consistency. The virtues apparent in Dr. Winstanley were real virtues, those which have their being in stability of principle, and their exercise in the finest feelings and best affections of our nature.

Dr. William Winstanley, the fourth son and seventh child of William Winstanley and Alice his wife, was born at Cuerden, near Preston, in Lancashire, December 6, 1772. It is known that as a child he was remarkable for an affectionate and gentle temper. It was his happiness to receive from a most amiable and excellent mother those first impressions which are of so much importance to the future character; and he is another instance of the force and value of early impressions made under favourable circumstances. Under the parental care and in the family circle, those natural affections in which the virtues have their commencement struck deep root in his ingenuous and susceptible mind. His parents were of that intelligent and liberal class of Nonconformists, who with an honourable pride laid claim to the character of *consistent* Dissenters, as respecting in others the right of private judgment in religious matters, by the claim to which they vindicated their own freedom of worship and opinion. They were members of the Presbyterian congregation assembling for worship in the united chapels of Preston and Walton; a religious society which had been happy in the services of ministers characterized alike by their piety, by a most amiable spirit of candour, by their rational religious sentiments, and by their respect for free inquiry. These circumstances must be presumed to have exerted their natural influence on the mind of the subject of this notice. In effect they no doubt materially contributed to decide his sentiments, his connections, and his conduct through life. In no narrow spirit of sectarian partiality it may here be observed, that the influences under which the minds of the young among the liberal Dissenters of that period were formed, were eminently favourable to the production of intelligence and worth; as appeared from the many examples of both produced among them. Whatever the disadvantages of their position otherwise, intellectually and morally it was no doubt one of singular advantage to themselves. Integrity in the profession of religion deepens the influence of religion itself upon the character; and their re-

ligious integrity was the security and protection of many virtues. Unfettered by the obligations of ecclesiastical conformity, and unbiassed by its worldly interests, they were in circumstances to investigate truth with freedom and impartiality; while learning and science, liberal and elegant studies, held in just estimation, and diligently and successfully cultivated amongst them, aided their investigations and gave light to their inquiries. Nurtured in the bosom of such a communion, the sentiments insensibly imbibed from infancy by the subject of this memoir ripened into that firm attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty, that kind and charitable estimate of the unavoidable differences of human opinion, and that love of good men without distinction of sect and party, which grew to be part of his very mind and nature. The early domestic influences have in this case been the more particularly noticed, because the earliest indications of character in him to which we can now revert clearly shew that, in respect of mind and temper, he was, in every following part of life, what from the first those influences contributed to make him.

The first school at which William Winstanley was placed was the grammar-school of Walton-le-dale, of which Mr. Orr was the master. His parents, who had left Cuerden, were at that time residing at Banister Hall, in the neighbourhood. In the autumn of 1785, they removed thence, and went to live at Woodcock Hall. This with its estate had been the property of Thomas Woodcock, his maternal grandfather, and became the inheritance of his mother on the death of an only sister who had been co-heiress of the property. After a short interval, during which he had no other instruction than that of the village school-master, William Winstanley was entered a day-boarder at the school of the Rev. William Tattersall, minister of the Presbyterian chapel at Preston (afterwards William Tattersall, M.D.), a man of acquirements and cultivated mind, whose school was frequented by the children of the principal families in the vicinity. Under this gentleman he no doubt made such proficiency as was to be expected from his excellent capacity and his habits of attention. It is probable that it early entered into the views of those of his family with whom the decision would rest, that he should be devoted to the Christian ministry, for which by the promise of his talents and dispositions he appeared to be peculiarly adapted. In

the early part of the year 1788, he was placed as a boarder at the grammar-school in Clitheroe, then and long afterwards in high repute under the conduct of its head-master, the Rev. Thomas Wilson, B. D., author of the *Archæological Dictionary*, an excellent classical scholar and skilful preceptor, and a man whose talents and social qualities gave him influence in his neighbourhood and made his society greatly coveted. The intelligence and engaging temper of this pupil attracted the notice of so discerning a master, who endeared himself to the pupil in no common degree by his ability and kindness as an instructor. The time he passed at Clitheroe school was spent greatly to his satisfaction: by Mr. Wilson himself he was treated with uniform regard; and from the first mention of this gentleman's name in his earliest letters to his relatives down to the latest period of his life, he never alluded to him but in terms of affection and high respect. As the time drew near for his leaving Clitheroe, Mr. Wilson wrote to his father, and expressing the satisfaction he had had in him as a pupil, and the interest and pleasure he should feel in continuing to superintend the progress of his education, offered, should he remain under his care, carefully to conduct his further studies with particular reference to his destination in life, whatever in the purpose of his parents this might be. But the time had arrived when it was judged proper that he should be commencing the professional studies preparatory to an exercise of the Christian ministry in the denomination to which he belonged. Accordingly, with this view, in the spring of 1790, he was placed at the Dissenting academy at Northampton,—the institution originally established in that town under Dr. Doddridge, subsequently removed to Daventry, and successively presided over by Dr. Ashworth, Mr. Robbins and the Rev. Thomas Belsham, but at the time of which we write restored to Northampton, and under the direction of the Rev. John Horsey. In this institution Mr. Winstanley pursued his studies assiduously, and with the pleasure naturally arising from the acquisition of knowledge and the expansion of the mind at so interesting a period of life, and in the society of others similarly engaged. Of the freedom of inquiry permitted, and the impartiality of reference encouraged in this institution, the result, in his case, as in that of its most intelligent and promising students generally, was, that he rested in the theological views known as Unitarian. From letters

preserved by his family, chiefly addressed to a beloved sister, it appears, among the chief topics of public interest at this time (the French Revolution, and the struggle for the abolition of the Slave-trade), how much the latter of these subjects had occupied his attention, and how deeply it had exercised his sensibility and his reflection. The sentiment of humanity and the love of freedom discovered themselves at this time such in his mind as they were ever after. These letters strongly display the reasonable, the right and the amiable in temper, which were so markedly his characteristics through life. They evince in the most pleasing manner in general the strength of his family attachments, and they breathe on every occasion a spirit of filial affection, duty and gratitude, which shews how sacredly the sentiment of that relation possessed his soul. One of those letters is on a most affecting occasion, under the shock of which the expression of sentiment and feeling is extremely touching. This was in November, 1791, when he was suddenly called home by the alarming state of his father's health, who died three days after his return. To his surviving parent his conduct was always marked by peculiar filial tenderness and consideration, of which she happily long continued to be the object; having died at the advanced age of 86, in the year 1828.

Among Mr. Winstanley's companions in study at Northampton, his closest intimacy was probably with Mr. William Stephenson, a student for the ministry, of superior talents and attainments. That gentleman having left Northampton and entered Manchester College, Mr. Winstanley, in no slight degree influenced by the inducement of his residence there, left the academy at Northampton and became a student in Manchester College, then under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Barnes. Not improbably, Mr. Stephenson for a time superintended the classical department in this institution, which he was eminently qualified to do. He did not subsequently enter the ministry, but devoted his life chiefly to literary pursuits, being for a time private secretary to Lord Lauderdale, and afterwards librarian to the Admiralty, and known as the author of a valuable Historical Sketch of the Progress of Discovery, Navigation and Commerce, and other works, as well as of some excellent contributions to the higher periodical literature of the country.

Mr. Winstanley entered Manchester College, Sept. 10, 1793; he remained there two sessions, when, having completed his

academical course, he left it in June, 1795. While a student at Manchester, he had preached in the neighbourhood as an occasional supply. He now became for a short time the minister of the Presbyterian chapel at Tunley, in Lancashire, to which he was accustomed to ride over from Woodcock Hall, whence the chapel was several miles distant. We have understood that the superior cast of Mr. Winstanley's pulpit services was recognized by his hearers; and that the qualities of thought and style which characterized them, aided by an unaffected, engaging delivery, made him a very acceptable preacher. The precise dates of his connection with Tunley chapel are not known. At the commencement of 1798, Mr. Winstanley, on the resignation of the Rev. John Pilkington, became the minister of the Unitarian congregation at Derby, a relation which he sustained from Jan. 14 of that year until Oct. 2, 1803. In this pleasing connection, Derby and its neighbourhood opened to him a most agreeable circle of highly cultivated society, to which his personal qualities made his own an acquisition. The names of Mr. William Strutt and Mr. Joseph Strutt, then members of the congregation, have since become historical names in connection with the town of Derby. Besides his intimacy with these gentlemen, must be also mentioned his intimacy with Mr. George Strutt, of Belper, of whom he was accustomed to speak with a peculiar warmth of personal respect and regard. Among the neighbours in the ministry with whom he had the pleasure of occasional intercourse, should be particularized the Rev. Thomas Astley, of Chesterfield; the Rev. George Lee, of Belper, afterwards of Hull; and the Rev. William Marshall, also of Belper, and afterwards many years minister at St. Albans. But peculiarly agreeable as was Mr. Winstanley's position at Derby, on mature consideration he there decided to relinquish the profession of the ministry. From very early life he had entertained a preference for the medical profession, which an amiable consideration for the wishes of others had hitherto induced him to forego. But circumstances at length enabling him to indulge his own taste, consistently with his sense of duty, in 1804, he entered himself a student of medicine in the University at Edinburgh, residing with his friends Mr. and Mrs. Stephenson, then living in Edinburgh. After a course of application to the studies here entered upon, in 1806 he took his degree of M.D. The thesis which he exhibited on this occasion, and of which the title is "Dis-

sertatio Medica Inauguralis de Hysteria," evinces in its treatment of the subject the lucid views, the knowledge, discrimination and sound judgment of the writer, and is dedicated to his connection, the late eminent Dr. Hull, of Manchester, in the following characteristic inscription: "Johanni Hull, M.D., &c., &c., in re medica atque botanica perinsigni, sororis dilectissimæ marito, hanc dissertationem consecrat auctor."

Dr. Winstanley settled to practice in Manchester, a place recommended to his choice by many advantages. Among these, one must have been the number of superior and eminent men included in the circle of his own personal connection there, and of the society to which this introduced him. In 1807, he was elected a member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester, then comprising in the list of its living members some of the principal names which have contributed to its distinction. In May of the year 1808, he married Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the late Samuel Hardman, Esq., merchant, a lady of highly cultivated mind, and of religious sentiments coinciding with his own. During the period of his residence in Manchester, he was one of the physicians to the Infirmary, and was ready with his personal exertion and influence for every valuable object at the call of benevolence. He gave before a Parliamentary Committee his evidence as to the pernicious effects of the excessive hours of labour upon the health of young children employed in cotton factories. It is highly probable that his valuable assistance was secured on the Committees of Manchester College, then removed to York, in the printed list of the pecuniary benefactors of which institution his name appears at a subsequent period. While resident in Manchester, he was an attendant at Cross-Street chapel, first under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Barnes and the Rev. Ralph Harrison, and afterwards under that of their successors, the Rev. John Grundy and the Rev. J. G. Robberds. In the spring of 1818, he left Manchester for the benefit of the health of his family. In 1819, he went to reside at Woolton Lodge, near Liverpool, which, with the land belonging to it, he purchased in 1828. Here, in the midst of a highly intellectual circle of society,—that circle on which the name of Roscoe has shed its lustre, and which included some of the most enlightened and valuable friends of civil and religious liberty, and of every great interest of humanity,—he for many years continued to reside. He was through this period a

member of the congregation of the Rev. Dr. Shepherd, of Gatacre, a man eminent in various capacities. And here was renewed his intercourse with the late Dr. Crompton, of Eton, which, it is believed, had commenced at Derby, and which now grew into the closest intimacy of friendship and neighbourhood. The almost daily intercourse between them was uninterrupted till Jan. 1833, when the family and friends of Dr. Crompton had to deplore, in his death, the loss of one whose benevolent heart and many excellencies could be fully appreciated only by those who most intimately knew him. Dr. Crompton's death was followed, in the spring of 1840, by that of Mrs. Crompton, a revered friend, deeply regretted. In 1834, Dr. Winstanley was placed in the commission of the peace for the county of Lancaster. As a magistrate, his influence was at Woolton exerted in various ways to the advantage of his poorer neighbours; and both in that capacity and by medical advice on suitable occasions (though no longer in the exercise of his profession), he contributed much to their welfare. In the course of the year 1840, Mrs. Winstanley became a constant invalid and great sufferer. Through her long and painful illness he seldom quitted the house, watching over her with the fondest care till death released the sufferer, in Dec. 1845.

He now concluded to leave a neighbourhood which was to him so greatly changed, and from which death and other circumstances had removed many old and intimate friends. When this determination became known, it elicited proofs of the estimation in which he was held, and of the regret his approaching removal inspired; amongst others, from Dr. Shepherd, who conveyed to him in expressive terms an assurance of his deep concern in the prospect of the privation of his society following that of other most esteemed friends. Dr. Winstanley sold Woolton Lodge; and to be near his only surviving brother, whose residence was at Preston, and also to be able to offer a town residence to his son, who was living at Chalgely, thirteen miles from that town, removed to this latter place and his native neighbourhood. Here, the unobtrusive excellence of his character, manifest in all the relations of life, commanded deep respect; and here those amiable qualities which had in him through life so greatly contributed to the happiness of others, continued to be exerted in every manner in which they could be exercised for others' good. The estimation, public and private, in which he was held, was

universal. His station in life and character held him forth an honoured representative of the principles, religious and political, he had always held and professed. While the state of his health permitted, he was a worshiper in the house of prayer which in childhood and youth he had frequented. Of what in every respect he was as a member of the religious society with which he was last connected, the writer of this notice would be at a loss to find terms in which to express his sense.

The family and friends of Dr. Winstanley had, even at his advanced age, looked forward to the long-continued enjoyment of the presence with them of one so dear, and who constituted so great a part of their happiness. So perfect in him remained the mental faculties and (with the exception of his sight, which was much impaired) the bodily senses,—so great a degree of activity did he retain, and so entire in him was the relish and enjoyment of life, that it had been natural to anticipate for him still a considerable prolongation of it. But the insidious progress of disease was secretly undermining his strength and accelerating the event which was to disappoint the hopes thus fondly cherished. With characteristic fortitude and tenderness for those about him, he suppressed the outward manifestations of the sense of pain. At length in his own judgment, and in that of his medical attendants, it became necessary to obtain the advice of the most eminent of the faculty in London. Accompanied by his son and daughter, and watched over by them with the deepest anxiety and the most devoted filial attentions, he proceeded thither. He bore the journey well, was cheerful after his arrival in town, and even walked out. An operation was advised as the result of the consultation held on his case. Of this he awaited the issue with perfect cheerfulness and composure, and gave the directions necessary for either event. The operation itself was most skilfully performed, and was borne so well, and for many hours he seemed to proceed so favourably, that in his deeply anxious children and friends hope began to be encouraged of a favourable result—only to be succeeded by the keener anguish of disappointment. The powers of nature in him at so advanced an age proved unequal to sustain so severe a shock upon the system; he sank in the arms of his children, and, without much suffering, in a few hours was no more. He died May the 15th, 1852; and was in the most private manner interred (the Rev. Thomas

Madge officiating at the funeral) in Brompton cemetery, London, and in a grave adjoining that of a member of a family to which, out of his own, he had perhaps been in life more attached than to any other. The grief of his death was inexpressible to his family, and a severe shock and affliction to all his friends; but resignation became easier where every reflection administered consolation, and as it was considered that he was released from the suffering which he had borne with such fortitude and such incomparable sweetness of temper.

It is seldom that personal character makes and leaves so deep an impression of its worth as it did in the instance of Dr. Winstanley, and never more justly. In him enlightened judgments and steady principles were combined with dispositions naturally the most amiable. What the tenderness of his heart made him in every domestic relation and in every nearer and relative connection, we are unequal to say; for it is a subject on which all eulogy were inadequate. Nor is it easy to express how much in private life, and in the intercourses of society, he was endeared to those who knew him by his amiable manners, his equal and cheerful temper, and his thoughtful kindness for others. He was assiduous in his attention to his duties as a magistrate; both on the bench and in matters of public business (though never assuming a prominent position) acting with the intelligence and conscientiousness which invariably characterized him. Everything tending to the public good, or to the improvement of society, had in him a sincere friend and steady supporter. To everything of this nature his time and attention, his personal countenance and liberal assistance, were most cheerfully given. In him the weight of station and character was seen uniformly to bear in aid of whatever is favourable to the interests of human happiness.

Steadfast in his own religious convictions, Dr. Winstanley was not one who dogmatized in religion for others. The principles he held stood in the most intimate relation to his own character; but he as religiously respected the rights of opinion in others, as he conscientiously exercised them himself. The Christian religion as in the New Testament he found it, he viewed with reverence, and regarded as the best instruction to mankind. His own personal religion was the "religion pure and undefiled before God and the Father, which visiteth the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and keepeth itself unspotted from the world."

What a great writer has finely said of one, the subject of his eulogy, is strictly applicable to the subject of this notice. "His life was, in every part of it, set off with that graceful modesty and reserve, which made his virtues the more beautiful, the more they were cast in such agreeable shades.—His character was uniform and consistent, and his whole conduct of a piece. His principles were founded in reason and supported by virtue; and therefore did not lie at the mercy of ambition, avarice and resentment. His notions were no less steady and unshaken, than just and upright. In a word, he concluded his course among the same well-chosen friendships and alliances with which he began it."

June 19, at Buile Hill, near Manchester, in the 76th year of her age, ESTHER, widow of the late Sir Thomas POTTER, Knt.

July 25, at Southampton, Mrs. TREMLETT, widow of the late Rev. John Tremlett, of Gloucester, and afterwards of Hapton, Norfolk, at an advanced age.

We have to record the death of another aged member of the congregation of the Old meeting, Ilminster—JOHN BAKER, Esq. He passed away from this life on the 27th of last month, at the advanced age of 80. This visitation of Providence, although not unexpected, has cast a gloom over many minds beyond the immediate circle of his own family.

Mr. Baker was born at Ilton, a neighbouring parish, August 30th, 1772, and was chiefly educated by the Rev. Mr. Cornish, of Colyton. The law being fixed upon for his future profession, he became the articulated pupil of Mr. R. Toller, of South Petherton, in 1788; and after he had pursued the preliminary studies, commenced his career as solicitor, first at Lyme Regis, but removed thence, after a few months, to the neighbouring town of Axminster. Here he married the only daughter of the Rev. Charles Giffard, of Chard, whose death is recorded in the Christian Reformer for March, 1843. His union with this estimable lady was one of much harmony and happiness. From Axminster, circumstances induced him to remove to Ilminster, in the year 1799, and there he continued to reside for the remaining large portion of his life.

Mr. Baker was a Dissenter by birth and education, being the grandson of the Rev. William Baker, who was for a long period the minister of the Presbyterian congrega-

tion at Martock. But he was a Dissenter from principle. Hence, through the many years of his connection with the Old-meeting congregation, he manifested a lively interest in its welfare, in which his amiable partner fully sympathized. Exemplary in their own attendance upon the services of religion, their children, as they grew up, were encouraged to give their aid to the Sunday-schools and other institutions connected with public worship,—a happy training, as they are still among the first to devote their time and their talents to the upholding of pure religion.

As a professional man, Mr. Baker ranked deservedly high. His legal knowledge was extensive—his character honourable. The sound principles of integrity which he had early acquired remained with him through life, to direct his conduct and to dignify the profession he had chosen. He secured the confidence of his friends, and the high opinion of all who knew him, because his character was without a stain.

With many men, an extensive practice and the cares of a large family fill up the measure of their life. Not so with Mr. Baker. Habits of application and study early formed were never afterwards broken. He read much and thought deeply. On many subjects he possessed a knowledge which usually belongs only to such as make the acquirement of knowledge the business of their lives. Politics engaged much of his attention. He was alive to all public questions, whether regarding his native country or distant nations of the world; watched with interest the progress of civilization and the extension of liberty; whilst his habits of reading and observation qualified him for pronouncing a sound judgment on the progress of human affairs.

Some years have elapsed since Mr. Baker resigned his chief professional engagements to one of his sons. He wished for repose, but not indolence. He still continued to fulfil some public duties, whilst his relief from the pressure of business only gave him an opportunity of engaging more freely in those occupations to which he had been always attached. Thus, as years gathered upon his head, he was making note of their course, and inscribing them with wisdom and honour. In the bosom of a kind and affectionate family, by whom he was not only loved but revered, he enjoyed a degree of comfort and peace which is above the common lot; and no flight of years appeared to impair the powers of his mind, or to diminish his desire to expend upon

those whom he loved the treasures by which that mind was enriched. At length he departed in a ripe old age, bequeathing his memory as a legacy to the surviving, and his virtues to their emulation.

Thus the upright and the faithful sink to rest, but they leave a hallowed train of light to mark their setting. The tone they have given to social intercourse, the integrity they have impressed upon ordinary avocations, the fidelity they have shewn in the varying relations of life, the reverence they have connected with all religious duty,—these have done their part. Many minds have felt their power: the base have been put to shame, whilst the honourable and the true have acquired a firmer courage and a higher zeal. Neither for God nor man have the upright and the faithful lived in vain.

Aug. 25, at Claremont, near Manchester, SOPHIA ANNE, the wife of Sir Benjamin HEYWOOD, Bart.

Aug. 30, at Calne, Wilts, Mr. JAMES HALE, aged 86.

Aug. 30, in Belfast, after a few days' illness, aged 23, JOHN CAMPBELL, of Crumlin, co. Antrim, student of divinity in connection with the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, a young man of high promise, universally beloved and respected.

Sept. 1, Mr. EDWARD SMITH, of Daisy Bank, near Cosely, aged 79 years.

September 3, at Tunbridge Wells, Mr. G. R. PORTER, late one of the joint Secretaries of the Board of Trade.

The name of Mr. Porter will long be remembered as one of the foremost among the labourers in the cause of commercial freedom. He was invited to the Board of Trade in 1832 by the late Lord Auckland, then its President, in order to organize there a new department,—that of statistics,—proposed first as an experiment, but at the end of two years definitively established, and at the head of which Mr. Porter was placed. It was here that he had access to those stores of information, of which, for public purposes, he knew so well how to make a profitable use, and the systematic arrangement and publication of which both tended to demonstrate the necessity of commercial reforms, of which he was the strenuous advocate, and rendered their introduction practicable and safe. In 1840, Mr. Porter was also appointed senior member of the newly-constituted Railway department

of the Board of Trade. In the transaction of the laborious duties of that department, which in 1845, when railway speculation was at its height, increased to an overwhelming extent, and especially in the preparation of the elaborate and able Reports of the Board to Parliament, Mr. Porter's services were as valuable as they were energetic, and were thoroughly appreciated by Lord Dalhousie, who then so efficiently presided over the department.

On the retirement of Mr. McGregor in 1841, Mr. Porter was appointed one of the joint Secretaries to the Board of Trade, and in that capacity his thoroughly practical knowledge on all subjects of commerce and manufacture, as well as his acquaintance with the science of political economy, was of the highest importance, and, combined with his industry and attention to business, will render it difficult worthily to supply his place. It will be some consolation, under the regrets which he has left behind him, that his great mission was accomplished, and that he lived to witness the triumph of the principles to the advancement of which he had devoted his life, and which now, under the direction of a mysterious Providence, are about to receive their final consummation at the hands of that party who, according to the measure of their light, had, when in opposition, been its steady and persevering opponents. His great work, the *Progress of the Nation*, will be a lasting monument of his industry and of his enlightened and benevolent views of commercial and social policy. Mr. Porter's many amiable qualities, and his conduct in the social and domestic relations of life, were such as to gain for him the friendship and respect of all who were acquainted with him.

Mr. Porter had retired some weeks before his death to Tunbridge Wells, in hopes of recruiting his exhausted frame, then suffering from a local disease.

Sept. 4, at Cirencester, I. HOWSE, Esq., F.R.G.S., Member of the Philosophical Society, &c., in the 80th year of his age.

Sept. 5, at Rounds Green, Oldbury, in her 83rd year, MRS. SARAH WELLS, who from her earliest years had been connected with the Unitarian congregation at Oldbury.

September 9, at Swansea, in the ninety-first year of her age, MAYZOD, the widow of the late JOHN ROWLAND, Esq., of that town. On the maternal side she was lineally descended from one of the foun-

ders of the Unitarian congregation in Swansea. By marriage, she became united to one who held a similar relationship to another founder of the society, and she was the sister of one of its most valued ministers, the late Rev. Richard Awbrey. Her character and conduct during her long term of mortal life were worthy of the religious influences under which she had been placed. She was to the last collected, tranquil and cheerful, deeply sensible of the unusual share of life and its blessings which had been her portion. Her faith was as strong as that of seer or prophet. Not in a moment of excitement,—not as an expression of feeling drawn from her by the endeavour of bystanders to pry into the experiences of the soul (solemn secrets of the breast, with which a stranger can seldom with propriety intermeddle),—not as the outburst of an unusual emotion, but as the expression of the habitual state of her mind, she spoke not long before her decease of the pleasurable greeting she would receive from friends who had entered the eternal world before her. There is surely in a character and course of conduct such as hers, ground for the assurance that a disciple of Christ, and one of the accepted by God, has yielded up the tenure of mortality for the enduring promised Christian heritage of immortality.

Sept. 12, at Camden Lodge, Birmingham, in the 68th year of her age, REBECCA, relict of Thomas Eyre LEE, Esq., late of that town, solicitor, deceased.

Sept. 14, at Walmer Castle, aged 83, his Grace the DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

This veteran warrior and not undistinguished statesman is about to be deposited in the tomb assigned to his remains by his Sovereign, amidst the deep regret and almost reverent homage of all classes of his countrymen. Superlatively great as a warrior during the first moiety of his life, he proved a patriotic citizen of

the country which he had saved by his valour, by devoting himself during the latter half of his public life to the better arts of peace. Born and bred in the bad school of Tory politics, he by degrees adopted more liberal principles, and with true conservative wisdom applied them to the government of the country. It must be remembered to his honour, that it was while he sat in the Cabinet that the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed, Catholic Emancipation was carried, and Free Trade established. In every period and position of life he seems to have been actuated by a strong sense of duty. "Some Frenchman," he once remarked, "has said that the word *duty* is to be found in every page of my despatches, and the word *glory* not once: this is meant, I am told, as a reproach; but the foolish fellow does not see that if mere glory had been my object, the doing my duty must have been the means."

During the last term of his public life, the Duke of Wellington has scarcely identified himself with any of the existing parties, but has been regarded by all men as a true patriot and the personal friend and adviser of a patriotic Monarch. His influence has been beneficially exercised in the House of Lords in reconciling by his example and his arguments a large body of Peers to that liberal policy which was demanded by the intelligence and growing political power of the people. Straightforward, truthful, and superior to all kinds of trickery and corruption, he had long enjoyed the confidence of his countrymen. At no time could England part with such a man without the sense of loss and deep regret. His decease at the present moment is much to be deplored. His experience and moderation may be especially needed in the approaching conflict of parties. His patriotism and invincible sense of duty might have proved a breakwater against the rashness and want of principle of the two leaders of the present Government.

MARRIAGES.

June 1, at the Unitarian chapel, Framlingham, by Rev. M. C. Gascoigne, Mr. FREDERICK NEWSON to Miss MARIA BALLS, both of Framlingham.

June 12, at the Unitarian chapel, Gee Cross, by Rev. James Brooks, O. BURCHARDT, Esq., Prussian Consul, of Liverpool,

to JANE, second daughter of the late S. ASHTON, Esq., of Pole Bank, Cheshire.

June 26, at Essex-Street chapel, by Rev. Thomas Madge, Mr. THOMAS D. CARPENTER to ELIZA, eldest daughter of the late Mr. THOMAS CHAPMAN, of Great Prescott Street.

July 5, at the Unitarian chapel, Carmarthen, by Rev. Dr. Lloyd, WILLIAM, second son of Rev. D. DAVIDSON, of London, to MARIANNE, third daughter of George THOMAS, Esq., of Carmarthen.

July 12, at the Unitarian chapel, Belper, by Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Mr. DAVID ASHOVER to Miss PAULINA CHOLEBTON, both of Belper.

July 13, at Hanover-Square chapel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, by the father of the bride, JOSHUA CROOK, Esq., of Whitebank, Bolton-le-Moors, to ISABELLA BARR AUCHINVOLE, second daughter of the Rev. George HARRIS.

July 17, at Chapel-Lane chapel, Bradford, Yorkshire, by Rev. J. H. Ryland, Mr. THOMAS DENTON to Miss REBECCA SUTCLIFFE, both of Bradford.

Aug. 1, at King Edward-Street chapel, Macclesfield, by Rev. John Wright, Mr. JOSEPH OAKES to JANE, daughter of Mr. George LAWSON, of Wilmslow.

Aug. 4, at Christchurch chapel, Banbury, by Rev. H. H. Piper, ROBERT DUKINFELD, son of Samuel Dukinfield DARRISHIRE, Esq., of Greenheys, Manchester, to HARRIET ANN, eldest daughter of T. R. COBB, Esq., of Banbury.

Aug. 12, at the General Baptist chapel, Worship Street, by Rev. Joseph Calrow Means, of Chatham, EDMUND, youngest son of Margaret and the late George BRACE, to ELEANOR, second daughter of William Foster and Esther ANDERSON, and neice of Thomas Ritchie, of Stockwell.

Aug. 14, at the Presbyterian chapel, Bury St. Edmunds, by Rev. H. Knott, Mr. CHARLES TUCK, of Woodbridge, to JANE, youngest daughter of G. MALLOWS, Esq., of Bury.

Aug. 19, at St. Luke's, Chelsea, Mr. E. T. WHITFIELD, bookseller, Strand, only son of Rev. E. Whitfield, of Ilminster, Somerset, to EMILY, eldest daughter of — PEDLER, Esq., of Cheltenham Terrace, Chelsea.

Aug. 19, at Gulliford chapel, Lymington, by Rev. Goodwyn Barmby, Mr. GEORGE WESTCOTT to Miss MARY JANE KEYS, both of Topsham.

Aug. 21, at Bowl-Alley chapel, Hull, by Rev. John Shannon, Mr. ALFRED RYMER to Miss JANE HOLMES, both of Hull.

Aug. 22, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. F. Baker, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM FLETCHER to ANN, daughter of Mr. James LORD, of Bolton.

Aug. 22, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. JAMES BUTTERWORTH, of Hurst Brook, to Miss ELIZABETH BUCKLEY, of the same place.

Aug. 24, at the New meeting-house, Kidderminster, by Rev. M. Gibson, Mr. HENRY HUGHES, of Buckpool, Wordsley, to MARIA, second daughter of the late Mr. James BADLAND, of Kidderminster.

Aug. 25, at Blackwater-Street chapel, Rochdale, Mr. SAMUEL MOORE to Miss MARY MEADOWCROFT.

Aug. 26, at the Unitarian chapel, Little Portland Street, London, by Rev. John Boucher, GEORGE WYLD, M.D., of Russell Square, son of James Wyld, Esq., of Gilston, Fifehire, to MARY EMILY, daughter of Benjamin KENNEDY, Esq., late of Upper Harley Street.

Aug. 31, at St. Mary's church, Bryanstone Square, London, LOUIS CHARLES, third son of the Rt. Hon. Charles TENNYSON D'EYNCOURT, of Bayon's Manor, Lincolnshire, to SOPHIA, youngest daughter of John Ashton YATES, Esq., of Bryanstone Square, and Dinglehead, Lancashire.

Aug. 31, at Gildeston, Norfolk, RICHARD ENFIELD, Esq., of Bramcote, Notts, to MARY P. HOUGHTON, daughter of Henry G. Dowson, Esq., of Gildeston.

Aug. 31, at Mount Pleasant, Bothwell, by Rev. Charles Clarke, Birmingham, Mr. JOHN HEDDERWICK to ELIZA, eldest daughter of the late George COOKE, Esq., of Glasgow.

Sept. 1, at the Dissenting chapel, Gorton, by the Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., Mr. JOSHUA HOLSTEAD, of New Holland, in the county of Lincoln, to Miss SARAH JANE CROWTHER, of Gorton Villa, Openshaw.

Sept. 7, at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., Rev. H. W. CROSSKEY, of Derby, to HANNAH, eldest daughter of Mr. Richard ASPDEN, of Manchester.

Sept. 12, at Christ Church chapel, Bridgwater, by Rev. W. A. Jones, PHILIP PESHAM to M. A. ARNOLD.

Sept. 14, at Old Windsor, TIMOTHY SMITH OSLER, of Lincoln's Inn, Esq., barrister-at-law, to HENRIETTA, second daughter of the late Robert ROSCOE, Esq., of Englefield Green, Surrey.

Sept. 15, CHRISTOPHER WM. RICHMOND, Esq., of the Middle Temple, eldest son of the late Christopher Richmond, Esq., barrister-at-law, to EMILY ELIZABETH, eldest daughter of John ATKINSON, Esq., of Frindsbury, Kent.

Sept. 16, at Mary-Street chapel, Taunton, by Rev. W. A. Jones, Mr. JOSEPH SENDELL to Mrs. E. COCK.

Sept. 22, at the New chapel, Bury, Lancashire, by Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., Rev. A. S. STEINTHAL, of Bridgwater, to SARAH, only daughter of Rev. Franklin HOWORTH, of Bury.